Serious situation due to increasing number of Shelterless People

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a very serious national problem. As you are aware, 1978 is the year of Shelter. So, this is the year when we have to assess what will be the position in the coming 10 or 15 years. The position is very precarious. To say the least, it will be a stupendous task. One of the estimates is that there will be about one billion homeless in India by about 2000 A.D. which means it will be of a huge proportion. And the position has been precarious especially in the urban anas. As on today, those who are living in slums without roof on their head, constitute almost 40 per cent. 35 to 40 per cent, in big cities like New Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras. The position is equally bad in the next ten cities like Bangalore, Hyderabad, Ahmedabad, Kanpur and so forth. Madam, as you are aware. Dharavi slum in Bombay is one of the worst slums in the world today, where because of the lack of shelter people have to crumble together in a very small place, leading to all sorts of problems. Therefore, there has to be a very serious evaluation as to what should be done for giving shelter.

When the problem is so acute in I the urban areas, it is no less acute in the rural areas. Many families there live without any shelter. Therefore. ^hey hope that if they migrate to urban areas, perhaps, they will be able *to* get shelter. So, they live in a sort of mirage, an illusion, and in the hope of getting shelter, they mjg-ra*e to cities and create further problems there. Therefore, there has to be a wry well thought-out policy with reeard *to* provision of shelter. I would like to urge upon the Urban Development Minis*r and the Government of India to clearly have a new policy which will give shelter to these people.

Madam, what is happening in the name of giving shelter is. sometimes we are creating only concrete jungles. We always feel that for providing shelter, all that we have to do is, perhaps, to give a minimum place for them to live. We do not take into consideration the requirement of those people who are seeking shelter. Therefore, while we are formulating a programme for giving shelter to those shelterless, large number of shelterless people in the country, we must also keep in mind their basic requirements. Otherwise, we will create a condition of frustration, despair in the minds of those people and a sense of being second-class or even third-class citizens in this grea?~ country. Therefore, while we are planning for shelter for those homeless in the urban areas and in the rural areas, we should try to avoid creation of concrete jungles about which I mentioned earlier, and we should plan in such a way that they have the basic, minimum facilities for outgoing purposes, for recreation purposes, even for bathroom purposes and so on and so forth.

Therefore, Madam, I would like to appeal, through you, to the Union Government to come out with a clear—-cut policy of housing for the shelterless in the country so that at least when we move into the next century there will not be a problem of shelterless in the country. The position as it is, is very actute, and even th© estimates are going to be high. Therefore, there has to be a very stupen' dous task on the part of the Government to formulate a programme for this.

Thank you, Madam.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION ON THE SITUATION IN SRI LANKA— *Contd.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now • we take up further discussion on the situation in Sri Lanka, Mr. V. Narayanasamy will continue.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry); Madam, immediately after the Accord was signed between India and Sri Lanka, the attitude of the LTTE, we have to see, for the purpose of finding out who was at fault and who went back though agreeing to abide by the terms of the Accord.

Madam, initially, the LTTE had reservations. They said that they would not agree to the terms of the Accord. But we find that after the LTTE leaders were briefed about the terms of the Accord, the LTTE leader, Mr. Prabhaka'ran, in unequivocal terms, though he said that he had not agreed earlier, stated before the public that he was abiding by the terms of the Agreement and that he would co-operate with the Government in implementing the terms of the Accord. Not only that, in pursuance of the said Ag'reement he surrendered the weapons and his lieutenants have surrendered the weapons in the presence of the press and the public. We believed that they have surrendered all the weapons which they possessed, but it was not so. We hoped that they will cooperate with the Government for the purpose of implementing the Accord but it was not so. I will narrate the instances from the same records from which the hon. Member has narrated with the background which he has given before the house. They did not surrender all weapons. They have been keeping lot of weapons with them. They have surrendered only limited number of weapons to the Indian Government and I. P. K. F. Then, their next strategy was to fight with the Tamil leaders of various groups. There were three groups TELO, EROS and EPRLF. They have teen shooting and massacring their own Tamil groups who have been fighting for the Tamils' rights in Sri Lanka. They have killed more than hundred persons belonging to other groups. The on-going war between LTTE and three stars—PLOT, TELO and EPRLF—has claimed over 60 lives This has been reported in the "Hindu" newspaper dated 15-9-1987, These deaths were caused by LTTE. Then our Indian Peace Keeping Force and the Indian Government objected to it and said that you have agreed to the terms of reference of the Agreement and now you are killing your own kith and kin. Our objection to the killing of the Tamil leaders by LTTE was made on 20-9-1987. Our communique has stated that the killing of the innocent Tamils which have taken place in Sri Lanka have largely been engineered by the LTTE. After these brutal killings now they claim that they are following peaceful Gandhian movement. After killing all these people now they are telling that they will start the Gandhian movement to achieve their aims. After killing all the Tamils who have been fighting for the cause of the Tamils I would ask whether such people can be believed. Madam, I would like to say that apart from this, they have ^also killed more than 100 persons belonging to EROS group. It was also condemned by the Indian Government.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nsdu): Just one correction. EROS are fully with the LTTE.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: My point is that the LTTE wanted to show to the world and also to ou'r country and Sri Lankan administration that they are the only force who are fighting for Tamils in Northern and Eastern Provinces. They wanted to eliminate other Tamil groups. They wanted to play a dominant role in this regard. In spite of this, our Indian Peace Keeping Force was maintaining restraint. Thev wanted to bring them to the negotiating table. That is how they have signed the minutes of the meeting on the 23rd September. On the 28th September they have raised some points on the basis of the minutes of the meeting and those points have been met by the Government of India bv persuading the Sri Lankan President, Mr. Jayewardene. They have played a drama by going

[Shri V. Narayanasamy] beyond the terms of the Agreement which was signed on the 29th September. They wanted the leaders' names to be changed. My hon. friend says that there was a slight mistake. What they have agreed on th$_e$ 28th September was that they gave three names and among the three names one must be selected by President Jayewardene. Our Indian Government has persuaded President Jayewardene to agree for all the terms which have been given by the LTTE. Our Indian Government has gone beyond the limits. Thereafter President Jayewardene was willing to appoint Sivagnanam as the administrator in the Council. (Tim$_e$ bell rings). Madam I have not even taken five minutes. Yesterday, I spoke only for five minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yesterday, you spoke and again today you are speaking...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Because it is continuing and I could not complete it yesterday.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time at your disposal is very short. Try to be very brief.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Yes. It is unfortunate, in spite of the persuasion made by the Government of India, the death of Dileepan and 12 LTTE persons, who were in the custody of Sri Lankan navy had happened. We are also paying our homage for those persons. Now, we say that the LTTE has betrayed the agreement. They have been trying to sabotage the agreement with the help of some I'o'rces who are working inside as well as outside Sri Lanka. The sequence of events would clearly show that LTTE was not in favour of supporting the agreement and implementing the terms of the agreement. This was very clearly shown. Then, after |that, they have gfsten support. On 29th. the LTTE leadership has formally assured the Indian High Commissioner that they will fully co-operate tn implementing the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement of July 29th, 1987. Further, it said, they have aiso assured him that as soon as the members of the Interim Administrative Council are nominated to administer the Northern and Eastern provinces until the Provincial Council elections are held in December, they will call off their agitation which was given by them on 29th September, 1987 and also fast unto death and other campaign, they will give up. After that, what happened? After the death of 12 LTTE persons, they went on massacring civilian Sinhalese population who are living in the eastern and northern regions and they have turned their guns against the IPKF. Our IPKF tried to persaude them and told them about the real position and also requested them to come to the negotiating table but they did not agree. They said, they are waging war against Indian forces and started firing at our forces. Therefore, our Indian forces had no other go except to disarm the LTTE. It is not a war by the Indian forces against the LTTE. The IPKF wanted to disarm the LTTE who have earlier agreed to support the Accord and who had also signed the minutes. Now, what is the position? The LTTE has lost the support of civil population living in Sri Lanka, especially, in the northern and eastern regions. I would like to quote that even after the announcement of the Interim Council, the LTTE who was collecting funds from the people who are doing business there when those people resisted, then the LTTE resorted to violence. It was published on 9-11-87 in the 'Hindustan Times'. The report says, another important signi ficant point according to the official spokesman was that the LTTE offered no resistance at Vadamaracheri. This indicates that the LTTE has lost the ability to give pitched fight to the IPKF. The spokesman contended that the LTTE could also be seen as losing sympathy of the local Tamil population in Sri Lanka. Then, when they found that they are not setting the suopo'rt of Sri Lankan people and they could not extract money from the

people, they have started massacring the people there. One of the hospitals in which patients were there was bombarded by the LTTE. Are they the saviour of Tamil people in Sri Lanka? The LTTE has taken a vow that there will be bloodshed. Mr. Pirabhakaran is blood-thirsty. The LTTE leaders are blood-thirsty. They do not want to see the Tamils living there in peaceful manner. They want to keep their supremacy there for which they are getting the support of certain forces working inside as well as outside Sri Lanka. This is something pathetic. Madam, there is another important point. An hon. Member from the other side said IPKF is committing genocide. I take strong exception to it because the Indian Peace Keeping Force has been given clear instructions by the Government of India that they should not cause damage to the civilian population. They said openly that they are fighting with one hand, folding the other on the back. The're were a number of casualties on the Indian side. 254 IPKF personnel have been killed. There is no sympathy for the Indian soldiers who laid down their lives for Indian dignity, Indian honesty, Indian merit and Indian tradition. But they /are telling that LTTE should be given importance and they are telling about cease-fire. Our hon. Prime Minister, in categorical terms, stated that only if they lay down their arms and only if they agree for the implementation of the Accord, we will agree for ceasefire. Nothing has come from Mr. Prabhakaran or other LTTE leaders from Colombo. Some negotiations are going on there and in that they have been telling that LTTE has agreed for cease-fire and the Government of India has to declare cease-fire. No authentic information has been received by the Government of India. I hope and trust that this Agreement will definitely give protection to the Tamils not only in the northern and eastern regions but also in the central and southern regions. If the LTTE kills Sinhalese **in** eastern and northern regions, what will happen to the Tamil minority in other regions? We will have to see the whole picture and not only one or two regions. The Sinhalese are the majority in other regions. Therefore, our Government has taken the right stand, which is the only possible stand. Therefore, we have entered into the agreement. We want peace in the adjoining region. We want that the unity of Sri Lanka should be maintained. India should be secu're from foreign powers. I whole-heartedly support the Agreement entered into between Mr. Jayewardene and our hon. Prime Minister. I further say that regional parties should not and cannot take political advantage of this issue. It is not a civilian t'rouble but only a Tamil issue there.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN (Tamil Nadu). Madam, Mr. Narayanasamy, in the course of his speech, was levelling heavy charges, unfounded charges I must say, on the LTTE. This kind of irresponsible charges on the LTTE will not defuse the situation in Sri Lanka, will not bring any positive solution to the problems which the Sri Lankan Tamils face today. Mr. Prabhakaran who was even on the other day a freedom fighter, who was the other day invited for a series of talks here, is dubbed and stigmatised as a blood; thirsty man so assertively. Let him say anything and give vent to his feelings. What has happened in between? A month earlier, the same Mr. Prabhakaran had been invited for a series of talks and a month earlier, the same Mr. Prabhakaran had been adulated as a freedom fighter, as a great motivating force for the liberation of the people as a great liberator. But now, from the same Benches I hear a kind of scandalous dubbing of this great liberator, great emancipator Mr. Prabhakaran as a blood-thirsty man.

I am not here to say whether the IPKF is wrong or the LTTE is wrong, By holding the IPKF wrong, I am not helping the situation. By saying that the LTTE is wrong, I know for certain

[Shri Valampuri John] that I am, in a way, precipitating in tne situation. Right or wrong is not the issue involved here. But cease-fire is the only issue involved with us. As Mr. Narayanasamy says, as many

others say, my Party has supported unequivocally the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement and we were all along praising the effort of the Government of India because we thought and we continue to think so, that this agreement is a very bold initiative in the right direction, because all along in a battered nation, a bleeding island, wherein the honour of Tamil people has been subjected to se'rious erosion, there will be some kind of peace, some kind of settlement, at least the killings will stop immediately. This was uppermost in our mind when we

-welcomed this Accord; even today without any reservation we lend our support to this agreement because we believe still the provisions of this Accord, this Accord alone, will bring a lasting peace in the war-torn island of Sri Lanka; we still believe it will not only bring peace, succour, to those people but also provide habiliment to those people who have been thrown out in the last thirty years. We still welcome and we still support this Government, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's Government, for whatever positive steps it has taken, it has been taking, in the right direction for a permanent peace, for a permanent liberation, in some way or other for the people in Sri Lanka, for the Tamils in Sri Lanka. I would like to call upon the honourable Minister, Shri Natwar Singh, to sea what happened in the aftermath «f the agreement. On the one hand we go on disarming the LTTE cadres; of course, it is one of the provisions of the agreement and you are disarming them. But when you are disarming them—I would like to appeal to

you, this is what is in the mind of the people of Sri Lanka, I say this because I consciously feel that this is what tKey feel~you are disarming the LTTE without trying to remove the element of insecurity in the minds of the LTTE, You may say safely that we have given a verbal assurance to them that nothing would happen to them because there is the presence of-the IPKF. Possibly no physical assault can come *on* the LTTE. But this is a mere verbal assurance. Can't you remember that the Prime Minister of a very great nation, our nation, was physically attacked? It was a blow not only to our Prime Minister, it was a blow to the entire India. What does it show? When there was no security, when there was no protection, for the life of the Prime Minister of our great nation— there was a murderous assault on him—how do you, from a far off Delhi, believe that you will be able *° ensure the safety of the LTTE men? You are a friend of Sri Lanka, of Jayawardene. For the leader of a great friendly country there was no security there. How then do you want them to believe that you would provide them protection? They are fighting for their liberation, for their Eelam. When there was no protection for the Indian leader, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, how can you assure them you would be able to give them protection in Sri Lanka? So, their faith

was shaken. It is not only with us. You must have seen, while you are disarming them—you may disarm them because, there is a provision for that in this agreement; you have our appreciation for it; we endorse it—I would like you to ponder over this question: While you are disarming them, are you not removing the only bargaining power the LTTE has, the gun? You will appreciate, you will accept, this gun has not come to them all of a sudden, it is not all of a sudden that they have taken to gun. It is after thirty long years that they have taken to gun after all other means to be reckoned with have failed. They have been

conducting parleys with Sri Lankan Government and there was no positive result at all. What amount of subjugation, what kind °f dishonour, have the Tamil people been put to? I need not repeat everything. Their children hav no place in he educa tional sector. Even in the constabulary they do not nnd a place. In the constabulary there was no recruitment at all. In a multi-lingual society, in a plural society, like Sri Lanka, the Tamils have no part in the constabulary. This was the situation. Their language was trampled upon. For thirty long years they have been passing through a kind of deadly night. And their last resort was the gun. This is a historical force which is in operation throughout 'he world. When people fought for theit liberation for thirty long years through every possible means, engaged in talks, talks, talks, and when finally the talkg were counter-

productive, when they were not producing tangible results, —and it has been proved throughout the world, throughout the history—they have been forced to take to guns. But now you are disarming them. I am not criticising you and I am not commenting upon your behaviour because that is a part of the agreement. But what happens here is this: In disarming the LTTE, are you not removing the only bargaining power? Are you not v/eakening their bargaining power? The only hope is that you are there and the IPKF is there. "When th$_e$ IPKF is there why do you fear?"—This da what you are trying to tell us and this is what you are tring t$_0$ make us understand. But I would like to inform you that yo$_u$ are removing the only bargaining power which they had come to possess after thirty long years. You are not only weakening them you are not only weakening the LTTE position, but you are also increasing the strength of Mr. Jayewar. dene. You see the intemperate language he has used, especially atfer you started disarming these people. He has come over here, the land of a federal set-up like India, and he had the audacity to criticise adversely and he was makign insinuations against m$_y$ Chief Minister. But you have not protested, Sir. Even if you say that you have protested, would say that it is only a feeble protestation, a mild one at that. Again, Sir, he assertively said, "I am to mention the behaviour of MGR before the accord. ". He stood by it. Again, you see, in Sri Lanka, Mr. Jayewardene says

[Shri Valampuri John]

that while everything is on, there is a prize for Mr. Prabhakaran's head, who is the greatest emancipator of my people, the greatest liberator of my people. Here the point is that while the Government of India is able to disarm one section, it is not able to do anything with the ether section. This is a quagmire and this is a piquant situation in Sri Lanka. This is what the Tamils in Sri Lanka think. Because of the presence of the IPKF and because of the operations by the Government, you are able to deal with only one section and you are not able to act effectively against the other section which is headed by Mr. Jayewardene. What happens here is this: There was colonization and colonization was the main and the cardinal question. Again and again, the LTTE and the other groups have been saying, have been maintaining, that colonization wag the thing that was stifling the spirit of this Accord. You see, in

this Accord, we have envisaged a kind of unification of the Northern and Eastern Provinces. When this colonization is on, don't you think that ultimately it strikes at the very root of unification and the very spirit of the Accord is lost? It is lost not because of the other things, but because of the systematic, calculated, machination of colonization. Colo-niza'ion was on. But I do agree with you when you say that the Government of India has protested. Time

and again it has protested. But the only thing

that I would like you to think about is this; If the Tigers do not hear you, you are able to disarm them. But if Mr. Jayewardene or the Government of Mr. Jayewardene, despite your protests against the

colonization of the Tamil areas by the Sinhalese, does nothing, you are not able to do anything. I do not charge you; I do not accuse you. But the situation is So piquant that you are able to disarm one section, but you are not able to go beyond your verbal protestation. That is the point. Time and again colonization is on. Here you are able to disarm those people who, you say, are not agreeing. They are not agreeing. On the other hand, you are not able to do anything pisitively against Mr. Jayewardene and his Government who have no id"n of putting this Accord into practice. What are you going to do about this? This is the major question that we have to decide. This is the problem now. You may go on accusing the LTTE saying that the LTTE is blood-thirst v and that they are killing the civiliana. I am sorry, with a paralysing sense of agony. I have to say one thing. Rlr. Narayanasamy was informing the _ House that hundreds of civilians have been killed by the LTTE. It is far away from the truth because there is no substantial evidence. Can you prove that the LTTF has killed them? After all, what is the record...

SHRT V. NARAYANASAMY; What is the record?... interruptions)...

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: Do not interrupt < me... *(Interruptions)*•...

MR. NARAYANASAMY; Do not interrupt me.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: What are you telling? What is the record? ... *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order,, please... *(Interruptions)*,..

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Narayanasamy, you hav$_e$ become a neo-Nazi... *(Interruptions)...* You have become a neo-Nazi... (Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANSAMY; You have become a Brutus • • • *(Interruptions)...* You people have become Brutuses now... (Interruptions).

SHRI T. R. BALU (Tamil Nadu): You are the Brutus now... *(Ir, ter-* uptions)...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You do not know anything $_a$bout ihe history of the Sri Lanka Tamils... *(Interruptions)...* You do not knw the history of the Srti Lanka Tamils... *(Interruptions)...* You do not know even the history of the DMK and that is why you said that w$_P$ wanted separate Tamil Nadu... *(Interruptions).*

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: Madam... *(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will request both the Swamis to keep quiet, please (Interruptions).

SHRT VALAMPURI JOHN: It is fighting for a cause. Whatever Mi". Narayansamy may say, I am not irritated, because we are fighting for a ^{r} cause, for a major cause, major solution. J want to say that apart from the facts, you must believe that we ar" Indians first and we are Indians last. But here we have been led to a verv piquant situation. My people fisk me. Am I to weep for the Indian soldiers who lay d^{own} their lives without exactly knowing whose, war they arefigh'ing? Or am I to weep for LTTE men, $_0$ur Tamil brothers? So our loyalty is not divided. We are first and foremost Indians. I do agree. I do pronounce this in a very effective manner. But I would like to point out that this puts a lot of strain on our sense of belonging *to* the nation. If I can put it submissively in P modest fashion, this much I would like to say that the particular situation that has been created toda$_v$ puts a lot of deadly strain on our sense of belonging to the nation. We are Indians. This definitely pu's strain on us. So I would appeal that you must think. Th$_{ev}$ may not im mediately act. You see only the ripples on the surface. I would lik$_e$ to submit in a very graphic way that Sita is the personification of virtue, she is the embodiment of chastity, but if Rama sends her every now and then into the fiere ordeal, Rama is forcing her fo go astray. We full" support all your initiatives, yon-steps towards permanent peace in the island. But kindly do not put us into this kind of precarious situation Necessarily we feel -that there is a deadly strain our sens? of belonging to the nation. Dr- M. G. Ramaehan-clran even the other day sai£ that he supports positively ell the steps that you have taken, you are taking and continue to take, in the right direction. He supports you. Had h been only a politician, he wc. ild have refected for a segment of people and he would have srid something else. He is not a politician. He is a states man. So the interest of Trcli th larger interest of India, is In H i mind. That is why he has been supporting *vova* cause, in the interest o^f India. Time and again you have been saying...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EJGTES AFFAIRS (SHRT K. NATWAR SINGH). He is a politician-states man.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN; H$_e$ i'-a statesmen. *(Interruptionf;) I* will not enter into that kind of semantic hair-splitting. Even when they asked for a ceasefire. I heard *?, amn* members sayin?: there is no ques tion of ceasefire because ther? is no war. That is not the kind of sewn tic play that you have come to play here. Ceasefire should come. And he is a statesman. Otherwise he would hav« been carried away bv emotion. Instead of that, he keeps in mind the larger interests, the inte-

[Shri Valampuri John]

says that he endorses the positive steps, right steps, bold initiatives, in the right direction. Supposing there is a war, you can see for yourself that Sri Lanka, however, you try to win them over—maybe you have been having so much talks, bilateral talks, for years, for decades—but when there is a question of danger from the South, Sri Lanka may not come with you. The Sinhalese may not be with you. The Tamils have always been thinking that India will help them, India is the home-land for them; tMs kind of thinking is there. But I have very serious doubt that this kind of appreciation, this kind of affnity of Tamils with India, throughout India, is being seriously
eroded. I would like to appeal to you to think of this. When you have lost the Tamils in Sri Lanka, the whole Sri Lanka will be against you. What I say may be a mad man's prattle, in your wisdom, but I tell you, not in a prophetic tone but in an assertive voice, that what I say will become true. Thank you.

1. 00 P. M.

SHRI THANGABAALU (Tamil Nadu>: Madam, with great respect and humility I participate in this important debate. First of all, nv salutations go to our honoured Indian Peace Keeping Force who are doing exaenplary job on the Srilankan soil to protect the interests of Tamils. Also, my svmpatm>s go to the Tamil Tigers, who are our brothers, who are misguided people and who have paved the way for their own destiny.

Madam, Deputy Chairman, this Housn has discussed the Srilankan Tamil orobleftJ on so many occasions in th*. Past. The problem of Srilankan Tamils has been there for the past...

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu flnd Kashmir): E\-eus ms, Madam. Are we skipping the lunch hour today?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you agree-

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Yes, we agree.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajas than): When was it decided that we will skip the lunch hour?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am entirely at the disposal of the House.
1 would submit that you may have half-an-hour lunch break and then carry on. It is an important debate. There are still 14 or 15 speakers on this substantia issue in which we are aE very deeply interested. I would submit that my reply would not be for less than half-an-hour.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It the House agrees, we can sit up to
2 o'clock and then break for hall-an-hour.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: We will do whatever the hon. Minister has suggested. If he has got other engagements, we have no objection.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; The Minister says that he will require half an hour for his reply. There are about 10 more speakers. I think we can skip the lunch hour if the House agrees. It is a very important matter.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I don't mind. I can reply tomorrow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Let us finish the discussion today. We have another short duration discussion today on drought situation. It won'* be possible for us to take it up if we don't. skip the lounch hour. I think it would be better if we skip the lunch hour. We can have the re-plv today, and then start the short dura'ion discussion at about 4 o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS- Yes. Yes.

SHRI THANGABAALU: Shall I •tart, Madam?

Madam, after 1983, after four years of continuous negotiations with the Sri Lankan Government by our Prime Minister and the Government with a motive to sort out the ethnic issue in Sri Lanka, this historic agreement with the great initiative of our Prime Minister, has been reached between the two nations. Madam, Deputy Chairman, as far as the Agreement is concerned, there is no parallel in the histroy of the world, particularly in the 20th century, and this is an unprecedented one. It has been acclaimed by all withi$_n$ the country and outside. Barring Pakistan almost all the nations of the world today acclaimed and acknowledged the very spirit of friendship of this Agreement. Madam, before the Agreement was signed, our hon. Prime Minister and the Government had taken the consent all the the political parties and also the people of the country. Even today, our countrymen are proud to have this Agreement and they are for the speedy and effective implementation of the $_r$ Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement. Madam, we are aware that on the July 29, after the signing of the Agreement. the Prime Minister of India was attacked on the soil of Sri Lanka for thig great achievement. This kind of agreement, this kind of achievement bas been the tradition of our land right from Gandhiji to Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Shri Raliv Gandhi. This has heen the tradition of our Prime Ministers and the leaders of the Congress Party. Madam, my fnemory goes back fo pre-indepen-dence davs. Even before 1947, our-great leader. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru went to Sri Lanka and sookp in sun-port of the cause of freedom of Pri Lanka. Even at that time and afterwards, our great leaders of the Congress movement had been supporting the peonle all over the world in their struggle for freedom and \r have a better life- After the Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement, the parties which were involved agreed to surrender the arms. Even the LTTE agreed In the beginning. And their leader, Mr. Prabhakaran said that he would abide by what India says what the Agreement says, and that they want peace in the Sri Lankan land and that the Sri Lankan Tamils must have the freedom of living and the freedom of justice and the freedom to have a decent human life. But what happened after the 28th o* September?

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair]

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as our Prime Minister has very clearly and categorically pointed out the other day in the House and elsewhere. Whatever the LTTE wants those things have been given to them against the interests of Other Tamil militant groups and against other moderate Tamil leadership-. Now, our friends think that only the LTTE ar$_e$ the representative of Tamils in Sri Lanka. It is not true. I want to inform the House categorically that for years, even af'er the independence of Sri Lanka, Mr. Selvanayagam and after him Mr. Amrithalingam, moderate Tamil leaders of the Tamil community, they have been subjugated. They had been aggressively fighting for the cause of Tamils in th$_e$ land. Yes, I do not deny that LTTE is also a factor in th$_e$ present days but LTTE is not the only factor fo$_r$ Tamils in Sri Lanka. My hum ble submission is that there are thousands of people, there are thousands of militant leaders who have given their life for the same cause that the Sri Lankan Tamils aare fighting today. With this agreement, certamty an ex-change has taken place, certainly ths direction of the Tamil community, their life, has changed and for it the LTTE should not claim to be the only benefactor. I humbly submi[1] today that for political advantage some of the friends on the other sfde may take Mr. Prabhakaran and the

[Shri Thangabaalu]

LTTE on their shoulders and shout slogans against this Government and Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, but I would humbly ubmit that the people of Tamil Nadu for whom they are shouting, they totally support Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and his actions...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Let us meet at the elections. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI THANGABAALU; I have not interrupted you when you were speaking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI). Please, please.

SHRI THANGABAALU: I would again like to inform my friends on the other side, let them not live in a fool's paradise, people are very vigilant and people know what is what. *(tiiterrup-tions).* People's verdict is the supreme and they mu-; t honour it. And my humble submision to the House is that today the problem of LTTE not implementing the accord fully is due to LTfE's misconception and misunderstanding and because they are not interested in a democratically elected body or a democratic process on the Sri Lankan soil. Madam, Deputy Chairman..., I am sorry.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; He is totally confused.

SHRI THANGABAALU: You are a totally confused person. I will never bo confused by you or somebody else. *(Interruptions).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Don't hear that side.

SHRI THANGABAALU; But, Sir, thsy should not interrupt.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I just passed a remark, why are you objecting? *(In-trrruptions).*

SHRI THANGABAALU: It is not your business. You sit down. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Mr. Gopalsamy, yesterday, tha dehate. asked at what stage Mr. Prabhakaran agreed with the agreement. He said, he never agreed with the agreement. I stand before the House as Mr. Gopalsamy has a great friendship with Mr. Prabhakaran. I have great friendship with him. I know what Prabhakaran said about the agreement and he agreed every time with the Prime Minister. Every now and then he discussed and satisfied himself. Another question he asked, who is Mr. Rajiv Gandhi to sign the agreement? I may tell the House that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has *every* right, as the leader of the nation, *to* sign the agreement, and the agreement will have it-, impact because it is signed by Shri Rajiv Gandhi, because he is the Prime Minister of India. It was the greatness and the mighty power of India that made Mr. Jayewardene agree to the accord lo save Tamils in Sri Lanka. The situation so demanded that both the countries enter into such an agreement. I would also like *to* remind the House that LTTE is not the only faction to be a party to that agreement. There are oher militant groups as well who have made sacrifices and are still prepared to make a sacrifice. These groups have also been fighting for this cause for the last 30-40 years and, there-fore, they also have to be a party to it The agreement between India and Sri Lanka not only helps the Tamils in Sri i Lanka but it also helps the Tamils in India; it helps our friends on the Indian soil as well. It helps the 5 crores Tamil population of Tamil Nadu. We have to see this agreement in that perspective, keeping in mind the wider range of implications.

My friend, Mr. Gopalsamy said as if the Government of India and our leaders com mitted a grave mistake from the beginn ing. These people must go to the people of Tamil Nadu and the Tamils of Sri Lanka and ask what they feel about it. I can quote 'Makkal Rural* a Tamil Daily, a great paper, according to me. Accord ing to thb paper, when the IPKF started their job of disarming LTTE people in Vadamarachchi, the homeland of Mr. Prabhakaran, the people of Vadamarach chi, the Tamils there, welcomed the IPKF and gave them sweets, requesting them tO take over ___ *(Interruptions).*

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY-; People distributee! sweets when Mahatma Gandhi was killed. Sir, this is a propaganda engineered by the Government.

SHRI THANGABAALU: If it is a propaganda, it is being said by *Ihe* Tamils in Sri Lanka... *(Interruptions).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN ^SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Gopalsamy, that is his information.

SHRI THANGABAALU: And don't compare Mahatma Gandhi, the great leader, with your people... *(Interruptions).*

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I know both the Gandhis, this Gandhi and Mahatma Gandhi... *(Interruptions).*

SHRI THANGABAALU; This Gandhi is a great *man... (Interruptions).* It is because of this Gandhi that the country is alive.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): Shame; shame; I disagree; how can he say?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He has *the* right to speak; you may not agree.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: I have the right to disagree.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI); It is his view; you cannot stop him... *(Interruptions)* You cannot stop him from saying what he wants to say. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI THANGABAALU: Sir, it is my right. *(Interruptions)* Sir, the Tamils in Sri Lanka would not have been happy, people in the homeland of Mr. Pfabhaka-ran would not have welcomed the IPKF, they would have not accepted the Indian soldiers as their brothers and saviours if they did not like them. I am not saying this. It is what the people of Yazh-panam say, it is what the Sri Lankan Tamils sav.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It is IPKF headquarters.

SHRI THANGABAALU: It is no* IPKF headquarters.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI); Mr. Gopalsamy, *yes*-terday, you spoke for 51 minutes.

SHRI THANGABAALU; I never interrupted him.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; I spoke for 50 minutes, not 51 minutes.

SHRI THANGABAALU: You have taken one hour. I will also take that much time.

SHRI T. R. BALU (Tamil Nadu): He spoke substance.

SHRI THANGABAALU: Sir, consequent to the agreement, when the names of members of the proposed In'erim Council were announced, what. vas the attitude of the LTTE? I agree with Mr. Gopalsamy when he said that the leadership of the LTTE was not mature and they could not give proper names. Why did they go back? The Indian leadership with all its skills and power of persuasion made the Sri Lankan Government agree to whatever Mr. Prabhakaran wanted. This was welcomed by the ten crore Tamils all over the world. They wero happy that they were going *to* get one more homeland, one more State and that too in the Sri Lankan soil wherein Tamil* will have the opportunity to govern themselves. Furthermore, Tamil would have an equal status with Sinhala under the ^ Sri Lankan Constitution. The LTTE leadership did not like this because they knew* that they would never get votes from the people and come to power. This is the secret. That is why they were dillydallying and went back on their words every time. That is why they threatened Mr. Sivagnanam with pistol that he will be killed if he accepted the offer of Chief Administrator's post in the Interim Council. This is the kind of arrogant attitude displayed by Mr. Prabhakaran. I can say for the information of the House that Mr. Prabhakaran once said T do not believe in democracy; I believe only in pistol'. He believes only in war. He sees himself

[Shri Thangabaalu]

as (he dictator of Tamil Eelam. That is why he went back on what he agreed to with the Prime Minister and the Indian leadership in regard to the lndo-Sri Lankan Asreement.

I wouldlike to remind the House of the jubilant welcome the people of Jaffna gave to the IPKF. This cannot be forgotten. They look upon the IPKF as a force come to liberate the Tamils from the LTTE. Jaffna was being ruled by the LTTE by force, by weapons. This was not acceptable to the Tamils in Yazhpanan and other areas.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You have aggresed. You have encroached.

SHRI THANGABAALU: It is not aggression. It is not encroachment. It is only to help the Tamils.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY You have won the battle now but ths war will continue.

SHRI THANGABAALU: It is not a battle. It is not a war. It is only a process of disarming in terms of the lndo-Sri Lankan Agreement agreed to by all parties. It is not a war which is going on there. If it is a question of war, India, with its mighty power, would have done it within two hours. We never wanted to do that.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; You recapture the area lost to China. Send your army there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Gopalsamy, that is his assessment, you cannot challenge it. You can have your own assessment.

SHRI THANGABAALU: Indian army with greatest restraint, moral courage and conviction has been doing the operation. *(Time bell rings).* I have not yet ^trated. I have not been given the time. You nave allowed him 50 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): AH right; take five minute*.

SHRI THANGABAALU: I cannot conclude in five minutes. I have just started and I have not even made my point.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, with great restraint and conviction our army is doing the job of safeguarding Tamils from the LTTB i and from other reactionary forces in other areas. I would like to remind the House that the greatness of Tamils lies in their bravery. Our friends must know how in a shameful manner LTTE is fighting the Indian Peace Keeping Force. Tamils have got the greatest heroic history. During the. period of Cholas, Cheras or Pandyas, they never bowed before anybody. At the same time, they never put up ladies, sons, daughters and small children before the war. And this is not a war. IPKF is only trying to disarm the militant to safeguard the lives of Tamils. In that situation, they claim that they are fighting a heroic battle against the IPKF, putting children and ladies in a shameful warfare. This has never been the history of Tamils before, in the past.

Our Government and our hon. Prime Minister has stated time and again in India and elsewhere that we are for settlement with the LTTE even after they have killed the IPKF personnel, even after they have shot at us. We are willing to forgive them for the betterment of 30 lakh Tamils in. Sri Lanka. The peace accord is meant for 30 lakh Tamils who had been butchered by the Sri Lankan army. It is our party that had agitated for them. It is we who had taken up their cause and now the DMK and other parties are trying to gain political advantage. They are giving a call of ceasefire. When the Sri Lankan army was attacking Tamils it is our party, our organisation and our leadership that stood up and agitated and sent emissaries for settlement. Yesterday, my friend Mr. Narayanasamy said, I am sorry for that, that Mr. Karunanidhi got a personal letter. It is not true that Mr. Prabhakaran and LTTE sent letters to all the political parties and likewise Shri Karunanidhi also got a zerox copy of the letter. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: He has admitted that he received the letter. After

the receipt of the letter from Shri Prabhakaran they have started all this.

SHRI THANGABAALU: After that letter, they are telling that they will sacrifice for Tamils in Sri Lanka. We know that. I also come from the same land, same part of Tamil Nadu. 1 know how they want to sacrifice for Tamils. Just in one or two districts 200 or 300 people went to jail. And they also came out on bail. This is the history of our friends.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; We have suffered detention because of our convictions during the MISA days. Don't try to belittle us. Twenty thousand cadres...

- SHRI THANGABAALU: No, not twenty thousand. I know it. I have got records. It is a fact. It was mentioned in the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please go on with your speech. Try to avoid it.

SHRT THINDIVANAM K. RAMA MURTHY (Nominated): But the fact remains that they got arrested and they came out on bail.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We decided that for so many reasons. We wanted to rarouse public opinion. That was our decision.

SHRI THANGABAALU: But I want to tell the truth to this House, so that they should not take undue advanage that they are the only Tamils who can safeguard Tamil interests. Wa are also Tamils. We are also Indians. We are Indians first and then Tamils. As a Tamil, we are on the same wave-length and have got the same interests as other Tamils, not only in Sri Lanka but alt over the world, wherever they are. We have protected the interests of Tamils. Our leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, is there to protect the Tamils for ever.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Twenty Tamils from our cadres self-immolated themselves for the Sri Lankan Tamil cause. What are you talking?

SHRI THANGABAALU: I am r* disputing what has happened. But I am making a statement of fact. *{Jnerrup-tions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No interruption will be recorded now. I do not want any interruptions. Let the debate go on. Please don't interrupt every now and then.

SHRI THANGABAALU: I would also like to make my humble submission that there was a charge from the Opposition— an hon. colleague from Anna-DMK. said it in this august House and Mr. Gopalsamy also asked the same thing—whether Government of India has got the support of the State Government. I do want to inform the House that right from the days of discussion with the Sri Lanka Government, the elected Government in the State of Tamil Nadu under the leadership of Shri M. G. Ramachandaran has ben posted with all the details. I also want to express my gratiirle to the Tamilnadu Chief Minister for his exemplary inte-est taken in solving the ethnic problem. He has been supporting hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi, on this issue from 1983 onwards until today and he will be doing "so for ever, I believe. Our thanks go to him. I would. also like to inform the House that the other day, our hon. friend, Mr. Aladi Aruna, hinted as if the Government of India and the Prime Minister did not inform Mr. M. G. Ramaehandran, Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, for which he made an unwanted comment which should not have come from the mouth of such a senior parliamentarian—I quote him: "If the Centre does not know how to persuade LTTE, you leave the matter to our Chief Minister Shri M. G. Ramaehandran", to which, with great regret, the hon. Chief Minister has categorically stated in a statement from Madras. It is from Madias, dated the 11th. I quote: —

> "In a statement here countering the views expressed by his party MP, Mr. Aladi Aruna, in Rajya Sabha recently, the Chief Minister endorsed the Centre'* stand on Sri Lankan Tamils. He stated that his Government toed the line of the Centre which arrived at creating-

[Shri Thangabaalu]

conditions of peace in the troubled Tamil areas of Sri Lanka. He further stated that Mr. Aladi Aruna's views on, this issue did not reflect that of the party and could be only personal. "

Sir, I want to make it very clear that Congress leadership has always shown exemplary character in maintaining India's unity and integrity and also, as and when they took decisions, they were helping the interests of the Indian people and also the international community. Therefore, , this should not be denigrated like that. Here I extend my humble thanks to the honourable Chief Minister about whose statesmanship Mr. Valampuri Tobn and the honourable Minister also spoke and said thai he has proved his exemplary character as a statesman in support the ethnic issue and supporting the Government ofj India to solve the grave problem.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): Now please conclude in one minute.

SHRI THANGABAALU: I will conclude. Now my last query to the honourable Minister. Under the IPKF operation, disarming of the LTTE and other groups has taken place. I thank, through this House, all the other militant groups and people who agreed to the agreement and are cooperating for its fullest implementation.

While concluding I would say that our Prime Minister has taken great care to see that the agreement is fully and effectively implemented for which there are constraints from the other side also. *X* should also say in this House that Mr. Jayewardene, President of Sri Lanka, is also facing a lot of problems with groups like the JVP. From his Ministry, the Agriculture Minister, Mr. jaisuriya resigned yesterday in protest against the Accord. There are constraints while making this kind of an agreement and implementing it. The implementation process will certainly face certain problems, but India has been constantly trying to persuade the Sri! Lankan President and the Sri Lankan President is also trying to implement the accord. In this connection 1 would like ta place one or two important factors before you.

Sir, now the Interim Council has been announced. It was due to the LTTE's - misconception that they could not function; the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister was not able to function. Now I urge upon the Government of India, through this august House, that with those who areporting the Indo-Sri Lankan accord, a new Interim Council has to be formed immediately so that the Tamil people over there could rule themselves, before the election, as enunciated by the agreement. Secondly, all the moderate Tamil leadership who have been fighting for the Tamil cause for the last 30 or 40 years should be given a lead in this so that they will certainly see that the Accord is implemented. Also, I do not want that the LTTE should be completely out of the picture. I very much want that they should also

. be part and parcel of the agreement. Still I appeal through this House to Mr. Pra-bhakaran and other friends that they should disarm themselves, come before the Government of India and support the cause. Further, the other moderate groups who have been fighting for the cause should also find a place in the Interim Council. This was agreed upon when our honourable Prime Minister discussed ' with them before the agreement, but because of the insistence of the LTTE at the last moment, they could not find a place. The LTTE and Mr. Prabhakaran did not agree and did not honour the agreement even when they got everything. But now, those who honour the agreement, those who are supporting the agreement, should find a place in the Interim Council.

Secondly, Sir, —I will take only three minutes...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no.

SHRI THANGABAALU: Only two minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Only one minute-Please co-opera^ with me.

SHRl THANGABALLU: Sir, as per tile agreement, i musi quole one statement of the Communist Party of lndia.

THE ViCE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JA-*(JESLL DESAI)*: Not now please.

SHRl THANGABAALU: Only one sentence. Why is the LTTE not co-opera-Ung wuh lndia? The s. atement says very clearly:

"LTTE link with CIA alleged. "

I humbly submit, according to the Communist Party sources here, the visiting Sri Lankan leaders blamed the LTTE, especially Mr. Prabhakaran for his intransigence and efforts to sabotage the Accord. It was pointed out thai the CIA agents had always been active in the Sinhalese extremist group, the JVP, and that their links with the LTTE had got an ominus potent for the future developments in Sri Lanka. This, I want to go on record because it is a very important fatcor in conection with why they are not agreeing.

Now they are getting arms against India. Even now they are getting arms from various sources to fight, to create trouble. They have killed many people on the Sri Lankan soil. We want to safeguard the Tamils in Sri Lanka. That is our total declaration. That is the total commitment to the Tamil people in Sri Lanka, not only there, but in India also.

My humble submission, lastly, Sir, is regarding the land question. Our hon. Prime Minister said very categorically about colonisation that after the entry into Sri Lanka, our Indian Peace Keeping Forces are not allowing anybody to do colonisation in the Tamil areas. This is the truth. Our hon. Prime Minister has said it categorically. Even Mr. Valampuri John said just now that colonisation is an important factor. Then we cannot tolerate. It is true. I agree with him. I am also one among other people. But I tell you, our Government is doing all-out efforts to stop that. Even Mr. Jayewardene agreed ta that effect.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAG-SRH1 THANUABAALU: Only one, My last point is, Sir, a week back the Sri LanKan nesiuent, Mr. Jayewardene sa. d, the letter exclianged between the hoa. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and Prsi-dent Jayewardene wid find a place in the Agreement too. It is a very good development. It is a very good gesture that the Sri Lankan President has shown and is also toeing the line of India that we should co-opeiate. This is another way of getting the Agreement implemented more effectively. I want to know whether the Government of India has got any communication to this effect in the SAARC Conference or in Delhi, whether Mr. Jayewardene has spoken to the leadership about this also. Ji that is so, I wish the overnment must take responsible steps to extend the Accord to that also eariy so that the Trincomalee area, the Trinco-malee Port and other areas will come under the Accord permanently.

Secondly, Sir, in the Accord, the letter exchanged between the Prime Minister and the President, it is stated that foreign forces which are living in Sri Lanka against the interest of India, will also be eliminated from the scene of Sri Lanka.

With these, Sir, the Government of India, the Government of Tamil Nadu, the people of India, the people of Tamil Nadu, the Tamil race oil over the world are with the Agreement, are with Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Whatever steps are taken in this regard are going to solve the problem of Tamils for ever.

My humble submission lastly. Sir,...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Your "lastly" will never come.

SHRI THANGABAALU: Only one. Nothing. Sir, as I said, Interim Council is a very important factor. I urge upon the Government of India to persuade the Sri Lankan Government to anounce immediately the Interim Council with the moderate leadership, with the supporters of the Agreement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JA-

SHRI THANGABALLU; That is the only solution for which again the people of Tamil Nadu, the people of India are I with the Government, are with th© leadership to support, and the Tamil people of Sri Lanka, even Sinhalese in Sri Lanka are with the Indian Government to see that a permanent solution is found by the Sri Lankan Accord, by the initiative taken by the hon. Prime Minister.

Thank you. Sir.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in England there is a saying based on political myth: The King is dead, long Eve the King. " Likewise, the Indo-Sri Lankan Accord is dead but long live the Accord. I have great respect for my friend Shri Natwar Singhji. He has performed a very difficult job indeed which I appreciate. This Accord whether it is great or small, important or unimportant, has landed us virtually in a mess in Sri Lanka. The Prime Minister who was full of joy and exuberance when he signed the Accord described it as "historic". He even said "a unique Accord of the 20th century". J am happy about his historic sense. I do not want to comment on that. Let him feel inebriated with his own exuberance and mistaken enthusiasm. But I am here to find out whether this Accord was ideal, timely and wise. The ethnic problem of Sri Lanka should be settled satisfactorily and should be settled in a manner taking into consideration the basic interests of the parties involved. After dragging our feet for nearly four years, the Government of India suddenly took a decision to sign the Accord with the Government of Sri Lanka, the President of Sri Lanka, Jayewardene. While signing the Accord the minimum conditions necessary for the success of the Accord should have been there. Sir, on whose behalf the Government of India has signed the Accord? The expectation was that it should be on behalf of the Government of India as a party and also an behalf of the Tamils. The Agreement should have been tripartite and not bilateral in nature. That was given a go-by by Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Why? Why did he not involve Sri Lankan Tamils in the Accord? Their consent, their involvement, their commitment, their concurrence, their unequivocal stand was also essential, mott essential for the success of the Accord. Yes, we have ben given to understand that they were consulted at every stage but consultation is not concurrence consent. Even there, it is not clear whether all the groups have committed fully, unequivocally, without any prevarication. 1 have two documents here, one is the letter written by V. Prabhakaran to Prime Minister on 14th October, 1987. There is another document by the Political Committee of LTTE. In a way, you are right. LTTE was evasive, was not categorical. In a way, LTTE has said, it will go along with you. Here are the woids of Prabhakaran. What does it say? "We have serious reservation for the Accord, yet we pledge to cooperate with India to implement the Accord in so far as it is in the interest of Tamils. " That is what he has written. That is not a total commitment. There has been a reservation on the part of Prabhakaran that has been confirmed by this document. The Political Committee of LTTE has produced a document. What do ihey say, "When the Government of India forced us to accept the Accord, we, having the interest of the Tamil people in mind, naturally refuse to accept the Accord. We pointed out drawbacks and loopholes of the Accord", and they go on to say, "the Prime Minister of India gave us many assurances and because of these assurances and also becaue we wanted to give a change for the peace making machinery of India; we came forward to hand over the arms to the IPKF, without opposing the Agreement, even though it had many shortcomings. We believed in the promises p'ven by Shri Rajiv Gandhi and we wanted to show him respect". And they further go on to say, "even though the peace Accord, *in totn.* was not agreeable to us, we came forward to cooperate in the implementation of the Indo-Sri Lanka Accord just to respect the request of India. " By reading these experts, what do you make out? I blame LTTE also in this regard. They have extended cooperation for implementaion of the Accord though they had reservations for the Accord. But T also blame the Government of India, for not being completely

sure about the stand of the LTTE in regard to the various provisions con-tamed in the Accord. It is the basic mis-iake$_($ basic flaw which the Government of India has committed. This has given scope for misunderstanding and differences. When this is the situation, you cannot throw the blame entirely on the LTTE. There is no use in saying that the LTTE is one of the groups. It is known that it is a group. But we all understand the LTTE as a very important group among the Tamil population there. Otherwise the Government of India would not have insisted on the concurrence of the LTTE so much and Prabhakaran has said this. Both the Governments of India and Sri lanka recognised the prominent position of the LTTE when it was asked to form [1] the interim Government. In the interim Government they got the majority at that time. You Therefore, let us not say that the LTTE is only one among maney groups. It is a very important group, perhaps the most important group among Tamils.

Coming to the next part, my point is that the Government of India should not have signed the Accord with the Government of Sri Lanka or Shri Jayewardene without the signature of the third party, the Tamil representatives in Sri Lanka. They should have desisted from signing. The ideal agreement would have been an agreement between the Tamils and the Government of Sri Lanka. There could have been another agreement betwen us and the Government of Sri Lanka in respect of various other things. I do not subscribe to the theory that the Government of India should stand aloof from this. No. You are involved, the nation is involved. Therefore, this is the basic mistake rnrriTiif'~, l bv Shri Raiiv Gandhi in a hurry. Earlier there was procrastinuation, delay, in reaching a settlement and there were persons in the Opposition who said that the Government of India should intervene militarily. I did not subscribe to that theory. But now what do you find as a result of this Accord? We are interfering military in Sri Lanka to play a reverse role. What is t^e reverse role? Tamils wanted us to protect them, to go there to save them as their saviours. f>om "the nslnncrit, pttack of Sri Lankan Government. What are we doing now? We are carrying on the dirty work ol Jayewardene. We advised him, rightly so, wisely so, "Do not try a military soL ution. " When Jayewardene said there was no political solution, there was only the military option left to him, we objected to that. But what is that we are now doing? We are playing a very reverse role$_f$ a diabolically reverse role. For the past four years or so, the Sri Lankan Government was not able to contain the agitation, the movement of Tamil, ethnic groups. Now, we have taken that responsibility on us. We are fighting them. By this we have perhaps saved Sri Lanka financially. The Defence budget of Sri Lanka has 2. 00 P. M. been taken over, the Defence expenditure of Sri Lanka, has been taken over by the Government of India. We are fighting their battle against our own kih and kin. I am told everyday we are incurring Rs. 3 crores and nearly 25000 people are there. For the first time in the history | of free India—I would like my friend to appreciate this point - such a large army consisting of three divisions or so is under the command of a foreign Government to fight our own brothers and sisters there. This is what has happened, whether you like it or not. I am not disputing the good motive of the Government of India here. But your good motive and your hasty action has landed us in such, a mess; we cannot get out of it. As I said the other day, the Peace Keeping Force has beenrne, a war-making machine, and we are fighting, we are b a combat situation; for now iong, we do not know. This could have been also avoided. Accepting the accord, I ask, what were the duties cast on the Government of India what were the duties cast on the government of Sri Lanka? Boh the parties were committed to implementing the accord....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN fSHRl JAGESH DESATt: Mr. Gurupadaswamy, I appreciate what you say, your line of presentation but the time is very short

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Others have taken such a lone time I think you will apprec'ate T do not take

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy] lime unnecessarily and as soon as I ©nd my arguments, I will finish: I assure you that.

There was time to implement the jva-keep. ng objective. My innds drew the attention of the House after the accord was signed, there were interne cine quarrels between Tamil groups. Jt was nothing un natural in such a situation. When there Was a conflict, an internal conflict, bet ween the groups, what was the responsi bility of the Peace Keeping Force there? They should have intervened, advised tnem, arbitrated, reconcild their differen ces, prevented one from attacking the other. It was not done. They have said it was not their responsibility at all. It is also in my view a part of peace-keeping. They have failed there. There was provocation by the Sri Lankan Government, but PKF did not disarm the Homeguards: they did not; they should have done that under the Accord and they should have created an atmosphere of peace. They did not do that. Sri Lankan Government d. 'd not take back the Homeguards. On the contrary, they tried to colonise - it is a fact that they tried to colonise - in the eastern province. That gave the provocation. So, When the climate was not prepared for the implementaiton of the Accord, natur ally difficulties emerged. The Peace Keep ing Force and our High Commission failed to take stock of the situation. They "T; itive. So, it evented suspicion in LTTE mind, and fear about their fture. When once the militancy is des troyed - the only weapon they have is *the* ihmtancv, i the - spirit is killed, the militancy is ended and what is left for them. If the accord is not implemented? When thev do not see any s'gn of implementation, they hove to be careful. It was the job of the Peace-Keeping Force to create conditions of confidence for the LTTE. Otherwise, if the LTTE was not accepted, even with reservation, tJl»V would lit have sum ndered the arms in such circumstances. But they did surr-on-W th arms; thv did it in the beginning. That process could not be cont'nued because of the fear and the suspicion on their part. That is the reason. Therefore, the present situation is mostly I created by die Indian Peace-Keeping Foice in Sri Lanka. It is not merely LTTE had reservations. The TULF is a moderate group. But they too had reservations. But what do they say? They have said:

> "The Bills before the Sri Lankan Parliament retain the power of Parliament to amend or repeal the chapter on Provincial Councils and the list of subjects and to legislate even on subjects transferred to the Provincial Councils by a two-thirds majority and the approval of the people in a referendum. This indeed would be a simple exercise in Sri Lanka where the majority community constitutes 75 per cent of the population. "'

They go on to say.

> "The Concurrent List has been heavily loaded and the Provincial List starved. "

So, even that group has said this. Now, in the face of these differences, what is the role of the Government of India? My view is that the Government of lndia did not take stock of the si uation correctly, properly and realistically, and they have failed to do so. In their anxiety to app ease Mr. Jayewardene, they went against the interests of the Tamils. You expect ihe Tamils to have a good opinion about the Government of India? Do you want them to have faith and belief in the Govern ment of lndia when they are siding hea vily with the Government of Sri Lanka? It looks as if Shri Rajiv Gandhi is mora interested in saving the accord at any cost. It is jast tike surgeon operating on ar dead. e i the case where the operation was successful, but the patient died.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You have correctly said it.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: The accord could be successfully implemented. But the spirit of the accord 'S arleadv kilted, it is alreadv deads T do not subscribe to the accoTd. But. having sianed the accord, the Prime Minister should see that proper conditions do exist there or created there for the imple-menta'on of the accord. There is nothing

in the accord to prcvnt the Sri Lankan Goveinment from amending the laws. On a future date they can change it and they have got the powers. The Prims Minister «ays. "It is a historic accord; it is the accord of the century. ". But it may prove to be a dismal document, incourse of accord, a dismal document, incourse of time unless we take proper precautions against the loopholes,, he dangerous loopholes in the accord. Therefore, Sir, I blame the Government of India for having been hasty and unimaginative and thoroughly ill-advised in respect of the various provisions of the accord and, more particularly, in the mater of imple-mentaion of the accord.

Now, how are we going to go from this? How lo reach the end? Our army is there. It is said that army has to be there as long as is necessary. What is that 'necessary'? President laye-wardene has also said that the army wilt be there as long as it is essential to keep peace for him. At what cost? With what repercussions? The Prime Minister has been warning us that we are short-sighted, the Opposition is shortsighted, we are not wise enough to see all the dimentions, particularly the security interest of India. I know that. We all know that. The Prime Minister sh-oould understand. He is a young man. » There are elders in Parliament. He has become Prime Minister *at of* India by sheer luck. He should first shed his arrogance. Some of us were Members of Parliament -when he was nlot even born perhaps. He must understand where he stands in this political millieu. When we confronted him the other day we only wished that he should get out of this quagmire. We asked him: why don't you cease fire and give an ooor-ortunity to the Tamils there to surrender arms and thus c-eate confidence in them? There is no confidence among the Tamils in this Government. I want it to be restored. I want his image to be retrieved and also the confidence of the Tamils there ^restored. I do not mind his image being retrieved. I am afraid he has not done that. What is wronc in declaring a cease-fire? What does he lose? On the contrary, there will be a gain to that extent. Many people will not die. Lives will be saved. Mr. Pra-bhakaran and the LTTE themselves want cease-fire. What more testimony do you want? And the Prime Minister says: unless they agree to the accord and surrender the arms, he will not stop military action. That means he has accepted indirectly that they have not agreed for the accord; he wants their agreement. Why don't you take the opportunity and announce cease-fire?

Sir, the brutalities that the army has committed are not to be described. They have committed excesses maybe not with. a motive. They have destroyed the University, library, scientific i laboratories; and they have destroyed even a hospital. Where was the necessity of destroying these properties? And thty have killed civilians in large numbers. It was not necessary. Why? What for? *(Time Br I' rings)*

Sir, you have cautioned me that 1 am over-stepping my time. I would like the Government to be realistic in their approach and shed their dangerous illusion and give up military means. President layewardene could not succeed in browbeating Tamils by military means. By military means he could not bring about peace. In that way peace will be brought in Sri Lanka only on the dead bodies of Tamils. He must be very careful.

SHRI THINDIVANAM K. RAMA-MURTHY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I am thankful to you for the oportunity given to me to say a few words on the Accord and to place on record my grateful thank? to the Indian Peace Keeping Force there in Sri Lanka for the honourable job they arc doing thwe. ! also placa on record my heart-felt condolences for the lawans belonging to the Army who have lost their lives in the great task that has been entrusted to them.

As far as the Tndo-Sri Lanka Accord is concerned. I find here a different voice from the voice that was heard in Ibii vcrv House a few months before. At that time, there was an appeal, there

[Shri Thindivanam K. Ramamurthy]

was a shout for the Government of lndia to interfere in order to save the Tamils in Sri Lanka. There was a call given by the D. M. K., AIADMK. and most of the other politioel parties 10 interfere militarily also. Of course, I rememoer similar days when the Janata Party was in power and when the same Tamils in Sri Lanka were suffering worst conditions. It was the Janata Government in power and at that time Morarji Desai and Vajpayee Ji said that they will not interfere in the affairs of Sri Lanka. It is the internal affair of Sri Lanka. They categorically stated it and they refused to give a helping hand or to shed tears for the suffering Tamils in Sri Lanka. They were in power at that time. Although the Janata Party might have broken into so many groups, I am glad that they are in a position to shed tears and comment on the action taken by the i Rajiv Gadhi Government to help the Tamils and to solve their problems in Sri Lanka. If we are to judge the Accord, we have to go into the situation which made it necessary for the Government of India to interfere in the aflairs of Sri Lanka and in the affairs of Sri Lankan Tamils. For that, Sir, I may be premitted to quote a letter of the TULF, from its President Shri M. Sivasitha-mrifiram and Secretary, Shri A. Amirtha-h'ngum. They have written this letter as long back as 6th of March, 1987, to many of the Members of Parliament. They have said:

> "In support of its policies of State repression of the Tamil people> the Sri Lankan Govenment has inducted Israeli and Pakistani Military person nel, and mercenaries from the Uni'ed Kingdom and the United States in addition to the purchase of an assortment of 'sophisridated military: hardware, includ: ng Helicopter. Gun-ships. Bomber Planes, and Naval Gun Boats, from various sources mainly South Africa/.
>
> In brief, the Sri Lankan Government is wae'ne: a war aeat'mt the Tamil people of the Northern and Eastern Provinces. The victims of th* aggression have mainly been the non-combatant Tamil civilian population.
>
> While the death toll in the anti-Tamil racial pogrom of June/July, 1983, which prompted India's diplomatic intervention was estimated to bo in the region of three thousand, the number of non-combatant Tamil civilians killed since the formation of the Ministry of National 'Security and up to now, on the basis of a realistic assessment, is in the region of eight to nine thouand. "

Eight thousand women and, children have been mercilessly massacred in Sri Lanka. It further says:

> "To add to this, meanwhile the economic and communication blockade which has been in force within tho Jaffna peninsula for the past two months has subjected the civilian populaiion to immense deprivation and suffering. Starvation starks the peninsula. The people have already been compelled to skip at least one meal a day. The fuel embargo has paralysed all transport and economic activities. Hospitals cooperatives, schools and other institutions have been crippled. "

Sir, this is the situation under wbkn^ the Sri Lankan Tamils were suffering. And I would like to impress upon this House that on the sufferings of the Taimls in Sri Lanka. Tamil Nadu and the Govt of India stood as one to share their sufferings, to share their feelings and they were trying to help them. When a total bandh has been called for in Tamil Nadu, it was not only that of the DMK or the AIADMK or the Congress or any other party, but it was a total *bandh.* And it must go on record that the Government afso participated in the bandh. They did not ply their planes The ships did not move out of the harbours. The trains did not run on that day. Not once. Sir but several times it happened. Under such circums'ances, it was regularly pleaded by evervone from Tamil Nadu that it is only the Government of India and ft'pnv Gandhi alone who can save the Tamils and no one else, and that

be should interfere. A military intervention was called for at that time. And I must also go on record, Sir, that even though the LTTE is to be given the credit of their strength, it is not the LTTE alone that represented the Tamils. We must remember that the TULF had 16 Members in the Sri Lankan Parliament. As elected Members of the Sri Lankan Parliament, as elected Members from the Tamil area and from among the Tamils, they were equally responsible to represent the Tamils in Sri Lanka. And what is it that has happened, Sir? The LTTE which has trained itself with arms was fighting against th Sinhalese 1 do accept that. But when the Sri Lankan Army fought against the Tamils, when a war was declared against the Tamils by the Sri Lankan Army and the Sri Lankan Government, what was that the LTTE was doing? Sir, they were fighting against the Sinhalese. But were they in a position to safeguard the Tamils 'here in Sri Lanka? They could not, they did not. They weie fighting against the Sinhalese and at the same time they were fighting against the other groups who were representing the Tamils, and they were killing them. On the one hand they were fighting against the Sri Lankan Army, on the one hand they were fighting against the JayewarJene's dictatorial things, but on the other hand they were seeing to it that they alone, the LTTE alone represent the Tamils and non else should he there to represent the Tamils. That was the position of the LTTE, that was the stand that they took. In spite of the LTTE, it becomes all the more important that India is concerned about the Tamils as a whole. Not only the Tamils living in Jaffna, not only the Tamils living in the eastern province of Trincomalee. the Government of India is concerned abpir the other Tamils also who live in the southern and northern parts of Sri Lanka. In fact, population-wise, they are much more. And I do not want to go into the details. Sir. today it has been said as to how the LTTE goes back on its words. I do not want to comment on that. But the past history is something much more bitter. More than the Sinhalese people, the Tamils themselves were the enemies of the Stateless Tamils, the Tamils of Indian origin in Sri Lanka. It was how tliey developed: ail this problem. If at all Jaffna is suffering now, it was because of their own making. But at the time of a crisis we forget things, we want to forget things to solve the situation. Only under such circumstances, we had to take certain steps, and those steps were taken with all sincerity and wi h all kindness. And we wanted an end to the problem. I want to remind this House once again that we are not for separation of Sri Lanka, that we are not for separate Tamil Eelam in Sri Lanka. We made it clear. Our Government made it clear. Our Prime M n-ister made it clear.

Hon Member, Shri Gurupadaswamy was talking about reservation What is the reservation that the LTTE had? The reservation was whether they should have an independent Jafna, comprising of independent Eelam, comprising of the eastern and the northern provinces of Sri Lanka or whether they should live as separata Tamil State within the federation of Sri Lanka. That was the thine, that was th« reservation. If at all there was any reservation that LTTE accepts, this was thd only reservation and nothing else.

And the other reservation he expressed was how far Jayewardene will be has to be relied upon, how far Jayewardene will keep up his words or will honour the agreement? That was the thing. They never doubted the agreement as such. They never objected to the agreement as such. Agreement as such they d'd not question. Here, once again, I would like to tell you, as Jayewardene and his army are the Sinhalese people, the Sinhalese army was killing the Tamils. So also the militant groups were killing the Tamils by their in-fighting and the LTTE in their objective to see that all others, other Tamil leaders belonging to other groups are eliminated, they were doing this, nobody can refute this. This has happened and our Prime Minister is on record ha-vina snid that the number of Tamils killed by Sinhalese is much less than the number of Tamils killed bv armed Tamils. This is the situation there. In spite of that, when we interfered, the Tamil people wanted interference bv the Indian

[Shri Thindivanam K. Ramamurthy]

Government, to save the Tamils as a whole, not to save the LTTEs, or EPRLF or any other particular ethnic group. We wanted interference by the Government of India to save the Tamils as such, to save the Tamils as a whole, not only the Tamils living in the eastern and northern province of Sri Lanka but also to save the Tamils living in entire Sri Lanka, in other parts of Sri Lanka.

SJr, much has been said about the treaty. One clause in the treaty says, after 40 years of Tamil agitation in Sri Lanka what is the position of Tamil language. The Tamil language was not recognised by the Sri Lankan Government. This accord sets once for all at rest the language problem in Sri Lanka. In the accord it has been said that the official language of Sri Lanka shall be Sinhala, Tamil and Bnglish will also be the official language. This is for the first time, after the emergence of Independent Sri Lanka that Tamil language was honoured. Tamil got due place and 40 years' of aspiration and agitat'on has come to an end with this particular accord.

SHRI T. R. BALU: I am sorry for interrup ing, I think the hon. Member does not understand the meaning of will and shall.

SHRI THINDIVANAM K. RAMA-MURTHY; Let him also go through the dictionary and find out what is meant. I expected that they would speak a kind word for those who have sacrificed themselves for the language. They did not mention even a word. Even if they had found any fault they should have come out at least now if they were able to realise it.

Apart from this, the--e was the other problem. The problem in Sri Lanka has to be settled not only in the interests of the Tamils in Sri Lanka, not only in the interests which our Prime Minister has mentioned but also in the interes's of Tamil Nadu for reasons that we were having the biggest number of refugees. Not only the Tamil refugees, but the LTTE, the EPRLF. the EROS and many other gro-ips and their leaders were in Tamil Nadu and they started fighting not only in Sri Lanka but in Tamil Nadu also. Having come to Tamil Nadu, having-taken refuge in Tamil Nadu, the leaders of all these militant groups started fighting with each other on the streets. It became a law and order situation in Tamil Nadu A'hich had to b_e tackled. Nobody will deny it. They not only killed each other out they started killing people in Tamil Nadu also. Sri Lankan Tamil leaders with their militant groups having settled in Tamil Nadu, started killing Tamils in Tamil Nadu also. There are many incidents that we saw in Tamil Nadu. Let us-not forget how they act when they are armed. It is not that we supported them. We cannot forget the bombing at the Meenambakkam airport in 1984; we can-— not forget the tragedy to the Ariyalur train where many lives were lost. You cannot forget that these people were-responsible....

SHRI T. R. BALU; How can he say that?

SHRI THINDIVANAM K. RAMAMURTHY; That is on record. This was the problem that we were facing. In the circumstances, demand for a negotiated settlement came up and we accepted it. Today, there was an argument saying that LTTE should have been a party to the agreement. I wonder hew could it be so. At what stage did the LTTE come to the-negotiating table? When negotiations were going on, LTTE leaders refused to sit with the leaders of Tamil population in Sri Lanka and discuss the matter with the representatives of the Sri Lankan and Indian Governments. In the initial stages they refused to come to the same table with TUT F; they refused to come to the same table with EPRLF. That was their stand and they were taking a dictatorial stand as if they were alone the representative* of Tamils and whatever they say should be accepted and nothing more. That was their stand. They had to be brought down to the table and told reality

I know there are people who organised an army, a civilian army to invade Sri Lanka and free Tamils. They are nowhere now, Iknow of people who are

championing the case for their own political ends. But it must be remembered that it was this Government; it was Indiraji; it was Rajiv Gandhi who mad© Jayewardene come to the table, to sit and discuss with the people whom he had sent out, whom he had deprived of their right of franchise, whom he had denied the membership of Parliament. He was made to come and sit equally along with the people and discuss. That was the stand taken by the Government of India and Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

In spite of all this, when the negotiations failed, when the talks broke down,

- the situation worsened. A war was dec-fared on the Tamil area and the Tamils, everyone was crying. We then sent our ships loaded with food supplies. It was returned. Immediately, there was heckling from the AIADMK and others in Tamil Nadu that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was incapable of sending relief ships and that they have been turned away by a small country. When the relief supplies were sent by air, when they were airdropped, accompanied by warplanes, T think, the DMK leader congratulated Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. But within a few days, as usual, he started criticising. This; ilso happened. *f* Let us not hide the facts. *(Interruptions)* When relief supplies were airdropped, when our warplanes went in support of this mission, the Government of Sri Lanka had to come down. They sought help from other countries but they could not get it. They had to come down. Then, negotiations took place once again and the accord was signed. At that stage, all grouns were consulted. It is an utter lie to say that they were not consulted. Thev were consulted and they gave their reactions. On the basis of this, certain improvements were made. I can say for the information of the House that when the Prime Minister returned after signing the accord and addressed the people of Tamil Nadu, in the bigcest ever gathering on the Marina Beach, it was the TUI. F lead-r who garlanded him on the dais and told him 'You have given us life'. The leaders of the other militant groups went back to Sri Lanka to surrender arms and to help in the implementa'ion of the other provisions of the accord. Mr, Prabhaka-ran also went back but with a reservation. What was the reservation? He wanted an independent Eelam. He said it. Even now he says it. He wants nothing short of Eelam. But this is one idea to which we do not subscribe, to which the other militant groups do not subscribe, to which the former Tamil Members of Parliament do not subscribe. We said 'we will not be of any help to you in achieving an independent, separate, Eelam. If you want, yon can go there and fight for it'.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; Mr. Rama-murthy, if you can yield for a minute. It is not correct to say that the TULF leaders did not agree with he concept of Eelam. They fought the elections on the plank of an independent Eelam and they won the elections. They never said that they were opposed to Eelam.

SHRI SHINDTVANAM K. RAMA-MURTHY: They were able to realise. They were able to understand the reality. They came to the negotiating table and agreed that their problems can be better solved within a unified Sri Lanka than under an independent Eelam. They knew that they will suffer under such a set-up. It is not that all Tamils are one in Jaffna. Mr. Gopalsamy knows better than me, the caste barriers that are there, the caste oppression that is there and how people arc treated as untouchables. We all know that. Let us not go deep into that. Tt i' neither in the interest of the Tamils nor in the interest of the accord. Whatever that be, it is a fact that the TULF leaders realised that there cannot be an independent Eelam and that the interests of the Tamils will be better served by having a separate State within a sovereign Sri Lanka.

I would also like to point out how far the LTTE honoured the agreement. This also we should know. They agreed on the accord but he went back. Then based on the accord there was the release of pri-son»rs. Prisoners of the LTTE cadre were also released. Then the surrender of arms took place. Then came the setting

[Shri Thindivanam K. Ramamurthy] were suggested. My friends are saying hat the eastern part would have become mgry and all that. What prevented Mr. Prabhakaran from giving the names from the eastern districts, had he wanted ihe man from the eastern part to become the i hief minister or chief of the administrative council? He could have given names !Yom Trincomalee area. He did not come out. What was the purpose of going back on the accord? What was the purpose of thwarting the accord and going back to arms? Much is said about colonisation. I sincerely pose a question to my friends whether it was on the question of coloni-ation lhat they went back or it was on the question of the selection of the chief, acceptance of the name of Mr. Sivagnanam. Was that the issue on which they went back? It is not that they went back on Ihe issue of colonisation. They left it to the IPKF. They were sure that it will be dealt within the best way. So, it is not on that issue that they went back and it is no good putting the words in their mouth and trying to make a mess of things.

About the accord, I would quote our Prime Minister. Cautioning against complacency in the implementation of the agreement, the Prime Minister noted that there will be many forces which will want to see that this agreement does not work out. All those forces whose presences will have *to* be removed would not like to see this agreement com? through. All those who feel, h; said, that they can benefit from the violence and the killings will not want this agreement to come through-Extremists on both sides must not be allowed to become nawns in the hands of these forces, they must not be allowed to break the peace and to provoke retaliation.

This is the far-sighted speech. It anti-cipated tha! some elements will always work for thp failure of thi accord. It need not be m Sri Lanka alone, it can be in Tamil Nadu also. And they are there, that is how 'hey are doing it.

At every stage we are doubting the bonafides of Jayewardene. It was all right till he came to the table. We also doubted him, but today it is not so. He has agreed, he has solemnly affirmed on the agreement. His Excellency J. R. Jayewar-dene, President of Sri Lanka, has also sent the following message *to* the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting held in Vancouver in October, 1987, and]j quote:

"The agreement seeks to safeguard and promote the multi-ethnic, multi-linguistic and multi-religious conception of society. It is the only way our two societies can hold together and progress as National States entities. " Sir. I also don't believe a man till he comes to the table, sits and discusses it, but once the discussion has taken place, he has gone on record and signed an agreement with the Government, ws have to believe him. But still you say that you are not prepared *to* believe him, he is not sincere. This is not correct. He has even gone to the international forum and said that this agreement is the best, he would see that this is implemented in the interest of Sri Lanka. And he has given various reasons for it. What more can you demand? What more can the Tamils demand? What more can a nation demand from a Head of State for the implemen-ta ion of the Accord? Here and there there will be problems. Implementation of the Accord will not be without any problem That is why every where we hav *i* got a monitoring sec[1] ion. Apart from that we have brought them down to the stage of accepting our Indian Election Commission to conduct the elections in Jaffna and Trincomalee. What else do you need?

Two things more and I will finish. Much i^ su'd about the IPKF. I would like to tell this House that the regiment that is fighting there is the Madras Regiment. If you allege all kinds of nasty alle-ga ions that you have said about the army, if you are going to stick on to saying that, then you an* no' only darkening the face of the armv th^re. but you are darkening the face of Tamils.

SHRI. V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, I want to correct it.

THE " VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Why do you want to correct it?

SHRl V. GOPALSAMY: All regiments are these. You should not give false report that only Madrasis have gone or Tamils have gone. This is wrong.

SHRI THINDIVANAM K. RAMA-MURTHY: 1 know how many wrong things have been said.

Before concluding, I would like to say only one thing about magnifying the situation in Tamil Nadu and about the stand taken by Mr. Aladi Aruna, the leader of the Anna-DMK group here. I have nothing more to add to what his leader has said.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRJ; JAGESH DESAI): That has already been said. Please conclude now.

SHRI THINDIVANAM K. RAMA-MURTHY; Second thing, I want to quote a narration from the *Week,* which says:

"Protest at home, especially from the DMK leaders in Tami Nadit, is indeed uncomfortable, but the government is doing well in ignoring it. First of all, the protest has had little support from the ordinary people in the state. Second, it should be understood in the context of provincial politics: having been out of power for more than a decade, DMK is just taking up any cause that can embarrass the ruling group in Tamil Nadu. Moreover, in an open polity like ours, one probably has to accept these small voices of dissent. "

This is a just thing that has been said about the DMK and their stand. We know their political platform. When a bomb exploded, we know how the DMK cadres reacted to the LTTE. I know when the LTTE used to misbehave, how the ADMK Government did not spare them. I do not ■want to go further deep into it. This is the way LTTE has been behaving. Do not make them supporters of Tamils.

na rar as Accord is concerned, it *k* • welcome feature; it is a boon for th* Tamils in Sri Lanka, for the Tamils in Tamil Nadu and for the Tamils all over the world.

Lastly, about **the cease-fire...**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI). No new point now

SHRI THINDIVANAM K. RAMA-MURTHY; No new point except this. I will not go in for anything else. About the cease-fire, what do you want? Ceasefire? All right. If a cease-fire is ordered, are you going to surrender your arms? What is it that you want to do7 I Are you going to ttike back and hide your arms somewhere els?? Or, if a ceasefire will take pi. ice, what position will the Government of Sri Lanka take? Tbat also has to be considered. It should not be considered from that position alone. This unfortunate position was man made, by the LTTE, and if you are going to surrender, if you are going [f]o be victims of it by asking for a ceasefire, then we should also know the implications of it

With these words, Sir, I am off. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI); Shri Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, please give some indication of how much time you will give me— not a commi: ment but just an indication.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI[1] JAGESH DESAI): Ten minutes.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is very **generous of you.**

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He should be given more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I could have definitely allowed, but what can I do? There are still some seven or eight speakers.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, as I listened to my colleague, Mr. Rama murthy, and his intervention in this very important discussion. I was struck by a thought. Reading about the debate as it had taken place in the other House and having sat through most of it here, I am compelled to remark upon an outstanding feature of it, which is that most speakers, inclusive of the Prime Minister who inter vened with a *suo motu* statement, had con centrated tither on a condemnation of the LTTE or a condemnation of the IPKF. Indeed, the Prime Minister set the tone for it: Two-thirds of his statement is con demnation of the LTTE and if, thereafter, the Treasury Benches engaged themselves similarly In that exercise and if some of us in the Opposition condemned the IPKF, I believe that both, really, missed the point. About the Indian Peace Keeping Force, I shall come to it subsequently in whatever I have to submit, through you, to the honourable Minister. So far as the LTTE is concerned, just three very short quota tions.

These are quotations of my esteemed colleague, the honourable Minister of State—a man of distinction and an astute practitioner of the art of diplomacy. Therefore, it is with some hesitation that I remind him of what he himself has said about the LTTE. He said, on the 19th August:

> "We are very conscious of the fact that the understanding and goodwill of the LTJ"E is paramount and fundamen tal for the success of the agreement. "

Then, Sir, the honourable Minister said—[1] bs knows very well the date on which he said — on a subsequent datec

> "I would also like to pay a tribute to the various Tamil groups and, in particular, to the LTTE and its leader, Shri Prabhakaran, who, despite some major constraints and reservations, have placed their trust in India and their faith ini the future. "

You would permit me, Sir, to be struck by a sense of irony, that after this ful orahe the honourable Prime Minister should have devoted two-thirds of his statement to a condemnation of the LTTE. I am not going to repeat what the Prime Minister had already said in his statement because it was just the other day, about giving everything to LTTE, etc. But indeed, just yesterday, in the evening, the Prime Minister again set the tone for this afternoon's discussion by suggesting that only two oppose this agreement. We in the Opposition, and then he said, Pakistan, in the same breath. Ordinarily, Sir, one would overlook this as a kind of routine cut and thrust of debate in Parliament, and given the kind of exuberant abandon, which has now become the characteristic hallmark of our Prime Minister's debating talent; that his equating the Oppositioa with Pakistan was inadvertent. But *I* have a serious reservation on that because what has now become a characteristic of his style is, a denigration which is school-boyishly amateurish. Therefore, without dwelling too long on that fact, the opposition to this Agreement is not merely from his political opposition in the country *or* from Pakistan which he fays is some small country which is in a corner somewhere, but it is from the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, it is from within the Cabinet of Mr. Jayewardene, it is from within the Tamil groups, from this very LTTE which had earned the praise of the hon. Minister of State, it is from the Tamil groups, it is from within the TULF.

Agreements, Sir, in essence, are not agreements between two individuals. They are not pieces of paper on which twoi individuals put their signatures. Agreement* are in essence agreements between people. That is why, I was compelled the other day to call it not an Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement, but only a Rajiv Gandhi-Jayewardene agreement.

I would like to submit to the hon. Minister of State that the effectiveness of a policy or otherwise can bs judged by only one criterion, because there is no other criteria and that criterion is what your policy has actually achieved on the ground. And that is why I come to view that this whole debate has shifted its focus. What is under examination is not the character of the LTTE. What is under

close scrutiny by this House as our func-'ion, is the conduct of the Government of India's Sri Lanka policy.

When we scrutinise the Government of India's Sri Lanka policy, with due deference I have up submit that we find it in matters. We are unable to recognise its contours. We are unable to be convinced try the kind of rhetoric which was used hy the Prime Minister that this is the "agreement of the century", that this is unequalled, unexampled world over. 1 hjad even then (cautioned the Treasury Benches that what you had done was merely the least bad option. In a basket full of bad options what you have picked up is a bad apple. Do not, therefore, call it the "agreement of the century". If we example the effectiveness of the policy that the Government has followed, I am afraid, no objective assessment will cate-gorise it as either an "agreement of the century" or as a grand success, which is universally acclaimed, which might be phrases of diplomatic politeness, or indeed as that which has opponents only here, the other and of the well, or in Pakistan.

Sh, I would like to share one more thought with the Minister of State which is that mistakes in domestic policy, though taking a toll, are more easily remediable than mistakes of foreign policy.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA) in the Chair.]

With due deliberateness therefore, I submit to you, Sir, that never has India faced as serious a problem so far us its security interests go, so far as its internal polity goes, as we are facing in the context of the condue or the Government of India's Sri Lanka policy. I put it to you, Sir, that never, since 1962, have we been in as much danger as we are today. And for bringing the nation to such a pass there is only one agent and only one which we can call to account, and that is the Government of India.

I do also submit, Sir, with due consi-deration that in my view the situation that has been thrown up in Sri Lanka and the Southern part of India is potentially and as it exists today profoundly more dangerous to India, to the federal unity of India than Punjab ever was or is ever likely to be. If after all this, th© Prime Minister, leave the Prime Minister alone, the Government, if the Government were to come forward to us and say what we are offering to you is an achievement of universal acclaim, I for one am not convinced. The substance of the Prime Minister's assertion as indeed the hon. Minister of State's assertion here and in the other House has been that there are three interests that have been served. There are three aims of the Government of India on its Sri Lanka's policy. Firstly, that the Tamil aspirations, and interests must be fully served. These are not the exact words but the meaning is the same. Secondly, that peace and unity must prevail in a united Sri Lanka, that the em-erald island must be the emerald island. Thirdly, that India's security concern must be subserved. I put it to you that it is much easier, in the realm of foreign policy, to establish what needs to be done, much more difficult, profoundly more difficult, to convert that which needs to be done, to convert that which needs to be done through the agency of how that is to be done. In the expression of what needs to be done in Sri Lanka, as the Government of India's or as India's Sri Lanka policy, it is the most elementary of tasks to say that Sri Lanka must be united, our security interests must be served, Tamil causes must be completely and for always... *{Time Bell rings)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRT H. HANUMANTHAPPA): I am not disputing the speech but I have to run.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I appreciate that. I must briefly examine these three propositions and aims of the Government of India on its Sri Lanka policy. Firstly the Tamil interests. I believe mat instead of Tamil aspirations being served, in fact, Sri Lanka has not only become the graveyard of the Tamil aspiia-tions, it has also actually and profoundly disturbingly become the actual graveyard of the Tamil citizens. We cannot take that lightly.

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

Sir, I would aJso like to put it across to the hon. Minister of Stale, who has witnessed what you have also seen in the House for the last two days that we would be blind not to recognise the Hew turmoil into which Tamil Nadu's politics has been thrown, indeed the entire Tamil politics has been thrown, we would be blind if we did not recognise that. We might disagree, as indeed I disagree with my hon. colleague, Shri Gopalsamy, I disagree on facts, r disagree on emphasis, but 1 would be mindless if I did not take into account the depth of his emotions, what moves him. r am appalled at the manner in which the Treasury Benches chose to barracks a citizen of this country, a companion and compatriot because he was so emotionally moved. Tamils are part and parcel of us and they are emotional, and if they are emotional it is all the more challenging to the Statecraft of India that we recognise that and in the conduct of our policy we put that as an added input, wi hout which no Sri Lanka policy of the Government of India will ever be success-fid. Sir, I have many things to submit here but time stops me.

Secondly, about peace and unity, in Sri Lanka, a number of speakers have already spoken about it. I wish to submit to you a recognisable reality of Sri Lanka as it exists today. When we say that we are there because we want to keep Sri Lanka united, look at the divisions that Sri Lanka, that emerald island is throwins; up in outface. There is the ancient Sinhala Tamil

division. There is now a division between Tamils and Tamils. There is a division between Junius Jayewardene and his own Cabinet. There is a division between the Jayewardene Cabinet and Sit'imavo Bhan-daranaike. How many more divisions do you want in Sri Lanka? There is a division which is potentially the moat dangerous and that which is really going to: ohailenege us, the division between JVP and LTTE. How are we addressing ourselves to these divisions? How is the Government of India's policy helping in bridging these divides?

I come finally to the question of India's security ink-res: and the solemn observations that have been made about the Indian Peace Keeping Force as also pleas for ceasefire. With your permission, Sir, f would like to read out something. It will not take more than a ininute. To do-that would better enable me to say succinctly what I uant to say. So far as. IPKF is concerned, for the first time in our history, we are engaged jn combat, on a foreign soil, without any open declaration of hostility. This is not a small point and people from the Treasury Ber; said, we are not at war, we are engaged' in an opera'ion. With a kind of florid buffoonery, masquerading as patriotism, it was put across[1] to us that to talk of the morale of the Indian Armed Forces is to talk as if one was engaging in an anti-national act. The morale of the Ind'an Armed Forces is not raised by what we say here, emptily, without really meaning to, in these, inside these Chambers. Examine-for a moment, what you are asking the TPKF today? You have not declared war. The bullet does not recognise whether you are only engaged in operation, you are engaged in counter insurgency oration, you are engaged in pence keeping role or you are engaged in battle. The bullet takes only one toll. That bullet renders a member of the IPKF either as a casualty or as dead. You clo * not call him a battle casualty. Because you do not call him a battle casualty, he does not get the same benefits from the State as he would have got. The Stat Rajasthan, which has already suffered the major casualties in this operation is not able to grant those casualties, the usual JUNGI TNNAM which would be the benefit of the soldiers, sailors and airmen. The Government of India has now stopped giving casualty figures. Why have you stopped giving casuality figures. Because they are profoundly disturbing I will go on: For the first time.

and this point bears repetition, our troop-are under the political control of a foreign Government. Sir, our troops are yet again engaged in finding a military answer to gross political errors and this is the second time in recent past. We did it i» Punjab, where after the Indian Army

Which is a national array became a sectarian army when it came to be questioned in a part of India, it began to be reviled in that part of India, as not a national army. It is the policy of the State, it is the policy of the Government of India which has brought Indian Army to this tha. yet another part of India today reviles the Indian Army. I cannot take this lightly. I appeal to the Government of India not to take it lightly. The Indian Armed Forces have not arrived from Mars. They are a part of us, a product of the very soil of this country. Don't place strains on the Indian Armed Foiees which they cannpt bear. You talk of Lt. General, Dipinder Singh, the Army Commander South. He says that I am fighting . with one-and-a-half arms tied behind my back. How can possibly the Government of India, in all honesty, without any qualms of conscience say that it has sent its armed forces to engage in a combat wherein the Army Commander. South is forced to say that I am forced to fight with one-and-a half arms tied behind my back It is the most vocal, most profound condemnation of the conduct of the Government of India's Sri Lanka policy and the kind of strain that the Government of India is placing upon the Indian Armed Forces.

Sir, all this, is contained a most profound statement about the failures of the Government of India's Sri Lanka policy. A word alone about what many people have suggested: "Cease Fire. " Here I have to repeat what I said earlier in the context of Sri Lanka and the mess the Government of Indio has brought us into. It is a matter of some indifference to me as to what the political fortunes of a single individual become or do not become. But, cannot be indifferent to the fortunes of my nation. What the nation today is engaged in, in Sri Lanka, through the agency of the Indian armed forces is a national endeavour. Individuals might win or lose, the Indian army cannot lose because if by your misconduct, by your absence of thought or by your lack of fasightedness you ever place a strain upon the Indian army, whether by cease-fire or such other please, then you will be guilty of a crime much bigger than in 1962, which the congress is already guilty of We are told that Sri Lanka would have become the den of many competing super powers and regional powers etc. 1 put ii to the hon. Minister of S'ate that we have already, by our actions and inactions, commissions and omissions, created a Lebanon in our South. Those waters which were free of security concerns for India since the Imperial Portuguese first entered here, hav* now become our security concerns all ovc. again. I am not convinced, Sir, that by taking this action the process of Lehar onisation of Sri Lank! has ever been i\ larded have alone stopped. I believe, I. hold Sir, that in fact you hove accelerated it, In fact, you have cieated conditions wherein it would now become easier for competing regional powers and super powers to trouble us, for the times to come and for that, like 1962, it shall be the Congress Government that will be he held responsible by history. As an Indian I concede, I accept that we must pay. every Government must have the courage to pay, the price for a policy. But no> one can possibly be asked to pay a price for a policy that does not exist. Today, the country is having to pay a price for an Indo-Sri Lankan policy that does not exiit, for the Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement which is not an agreement and which has now turned out to be merely a trick. You cannot ask the Indian army to die for the sake of trickery. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will be replying to the debates later. I just want to make one observation. Jaswantji referred to what I said in the House about the LTI"E and about Mr. Prabhakaran. Yes, I did. And I am profoundly and deeply sorry that the attitude of the LTTE and its leadership had altered so drastically in the last few weeks and that we have landed in this situation.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir for the last two days this House has been discussing a matter which, is of great significance for all of us and a very sens. -

[Shri Anand Sharma] Jive issue for the nation. There have been accusations and aspersions cast on the Indian Peace Keeping Force. And the very necessity, the need and the justification et fndc-Sri Lankan Agreement has been called in question. We cannot, vhile discussing this issue, ignore the factual i reality, the history of the ethnic crisis, the reasons tor which India had to come into the picture. We all know that, the crisis in Sri Lanka dates back to hundreds at years. Between the Sinhalese and the lamils there are serious differences which, have led to recurding violence, mutual distrust and suspicion. This crisis, had assumed acute dimensions in 1983 when the carnage took place and large-scale violence was there. After that, we were all witness to the sufferings of the Tamils in th *s* north and east of Sri Lanka, the actions of the Sri Lankan army and later on the embargo. At that time we as one nation, as one people, expressed our solidarity with the suffering people of the Jaffna peninsula. The Government of India and the people of India opposed any military solution and wa repeatedly pleaded for a peaceful, negotiated settlement. We pleaded, we strived for a solution within the framework of a united Sri Lanka. It was at that time, we saw the sinister presence of various other forces in Sri Lanka, the presence of those forces which was, bound to endanger the very security of India and peace in the region The Prime Minister in his statement had referred to this in detail, and many of my other colleagues to did so. We must not overlook the long-term interests of the region, the long-term security interests of the country which are verv vital to us, while discussing this matter. And if today, this question is asked how me came into the picture and why we came into the picture, it is most absurd. It defies all logic. Do I have to remind those friends who, have questioned it that it was the Government of Sri Lanka convinced of the sincerity of India which was always supporting the just cause of Tamils and called for a solution within the framework united Sri Lanka, itself requested the Indian Government to render its good offices for a lasting solution, all the Tamil groups two requested us and that is how we came into the picture? The Agreement signed between the Prime Minister of India and the President *of* Sri Lanka is definitely a historic accord; it is historic and unprecedented. What is wrool with it if we say these words? We have shown to the world how regional cooperation and peace can be promoted by two sovereign States. It has been internation ally acclaimed as an act of courage and bold statesmanship. People everywhere are saying it. World leaders are acclaiming this Accord. When w_e say so, should we be ridiculed for political reason. ? It pains me a lot. This is^ue, this matter, i_s not being viewed by some friends in a national perspective but from a regional perspective. There are narrow considerations motivating the expression of views, not national considerations, not national perception, reflected in the speeches of some of the friends. This is most unfortunate. When the question of Indian forces is there we as a nation are concerned, let us not divide our concerned between Tamils and non-Tamils. We as Indians, were always concerned for Tamils, we shall always be, and that is what our Prime Minister, OUT Government, is trying to do, to ensure peace and a lasting solution.

Sir, today, there are claims and statements are being read out that the Tamils in Sri Lanka never accepted this accord, that the LTTE never accepted this accord. Yesterday and today this was heard here. But the truth is that, not only the Tamil groups accepted it, but also, later on. when, the agreement was signed, they all praised the accord. All the groups ranging from the political groups like the TULF to the militant groups praised it and they all supported it. Sir, when the news reached Jaffna that the agreement had been signed, there was jubilation and sweets were distributed. There were cheers for the Peace-Keeping Force. If that wa? not support, if that was not the support of the people of Tamil origin in Sri Lanka, then what was it? Should I name the groups, Individual groups, political and militant groups which had supported it? Even the LTTE—though I concede that there may be some reservations—while participating in the process of implementation of the accord gave their approval. If that

was not so, why were they negotiating and discussing the representation in the Provincial Councils? As late as on 29th September, the LTTE leadership was discussing the matter and they were accommodated in a manner which has no parallel. They had given their names for representation in the Council. Then they withdrew the names, they changed the names and we kept on accommodating Jhem. As the Prime Miniiler has said, the minutes which were signed, after the meeting, on the 29th September are proof enough that they were a party to the process of implementation.

Sir, the subsequent developments, we all will say, were unfortunate and we all are sad. But we cannot accuse the IPKF and _we cannot accuse the Indian Government for the present situation. I need not go into the details as to how the accord was being implemented. But there have definitely been some steps irrespective of the reservations. One may say, "'Well, the Tamils' aspirations were not mat. ". But is it not a fact that our Prime Minister lias taken a firm assurance from the Sri Lankan President? Sir, it is for the first time that in a country which has a unitary Constitution Provincial Councils are being constituted. It is a path-breaking effort and a new beginning. It requires patience and faith to go on with the process of im-plemntation of the accord peacefully for the restoration of peace. Sir, it was the LTTE which went back on its word. It was they who, for reasons inexplicable, started an anti-Indian tirade. We all feel that the suicide by the LTTE leaders was most unfortunate and should not have taken place. But the IPKF was not responsible. Immediately after that what did we see? There wos wide-spread violence and there was the possibility of a massive backlash. There was an anti-IPKF campaign. The IPKF soldiers were gunned down, sniping and butchering started. Who started the present violence? The IPKF had to go in for action to disarm are group which, had gone back on its word and which was trying *to* create an atmosphere of violence and violating the agreement. The IPKF had an obligation. It was an agreement signed between two sovereign nations. Who is questioning it? It fa the elected Government and the Prime Minister of this country who. bav« the mandate to sign the agreement and the elected President of Sri Lanka. It fa between two sovereign nations. It was tried to be violated. Subsequently, Sir, those friends who are today talking are forgetting that even before this happened, there was widespread killing, massacre of militant Tamil cadres—PLOT, TELO, TULT and so many other groups. By whom? By the LTTE. But while discussing this issue, we have to discuss the behaviour and attitude of the LTTE, its philosophy, what it represents. The LTTE kept back arms to subjugate by violence those groups which they thought might be a challenge... *(Time bell rings)* What we saw after that there was killing of these people. Those who criticise IPKF, did they condemn the LTTE for killing those militant Tami! cadres. Why did they remain silent at that time? Subsequently we also know that when the Indian forces went in they were under strict instructions and they have done everything possible to prevent civilian casualties. Even Jaswant Singhji who was the previous speaker also said that they are fighting with one-and-a-half arms behind their back—maybe, one arm behind their back. It is this army dedicated to discipline which continued itself to its brief, and it has suffered heavy casualties in the process. This has no parallel in the whole world. This is only a disarming process; this is not a battle. If anybody describes it otherwise, he has done a great injustice to this nation. Sir, the Indian army could have used artillery cover, but they did not. But it is being accused. I would like to put the record straight. Yesterday also, there were false accusations and unjustified aspersions against the army there. We are all proud of its sacrifices and its spirit of discipline. But, Sir, we are overlooking what the LTTE was doing. They were using, it has been said earlier, women and children as human shields, children as human bombs. If they were using them, it is reprehensible. There fa no word of condemnation for this?

Sir, refrences were made to newspaper reports of some western dailies. Who is behind this game of denigration of the Indian Peace Keeping Force? Those who

*

. [Shri Anand Sharma]

are opposed—maybe because they have lost ihe possibility of a toe-hold in Sri Lanka. Sir, what I feel sad about is that the Indian soldiers who wore cautious to protect the civilians, who are rendering all possible relief and assistance, who are just fulfilling these obligations of this country under this Agrer-mem, when they were killed, they were given tyre treatment. Tyres were put around their necks and they were burnt alieve.

SHRl V. GOPALSAMY; It is totally false. It was denied by the IPKF Commanders themselves. This is a false story. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Minister, you cannot silence me. You cannot shout me down.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA); Please sit down. Mr. Anand Sharma, please conclude now.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA; This is what I said. Let us hav$_s$ a perspective. When I am speaking, I should be given adequate time to complete. Please forgive me for saying so. Sir, we are trying to give an impression as if this is a regional debate. This is a national issue. I will repeat, Sir, that I feel sad when my country's honour is attacked. As an Indian. I feel sad and ashamed when Indian troops, in spite of their nacrifices and their discipline, are accused of genocide. I condemn the statement made by my colleague yesterday. T condemn it in unequivocal terms to put the record straight. Sir, if there is an action against one particular group, can we say that action is against teh Tamils? Does the LTTE represent Tamils?

SHRT V. GOPALSAMY; Now the Tamil blood is flowing in the streets of Sri Lanka.

SHRl MIRZA IRSHHADBATG (Gujarat): What is it. Sir? He is interrupting all the time. He has had enough time.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA; Please bear with me. Let us analyse developments with an open mind. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VITHAHLBHAI MOTIRAM" PATEL (Gujarat): You go and fight there.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; We are crying in our hearts. He says that I should go to Sri Lanka and fight there. Against whom? Against your Army? I should fight against whom?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI *it.* HANUMANTHAPPA): Please don't interrupt. You had your full time. Please sit down. The interruptions will not be recorded.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHR MM. JACOB); On are point of order, Sir. Rule 235, Sub-rule (ix) lays:

> "A member shall not obstruct pro-ceedings, his or interrupt and avoid making running commentaries when speeches are being made in 'he Council. "

Please instruct him not to do so. The other Members also spoke. Mr. Gopalsamy spoke for one hour. All the Members were listening to him. Now all the Members should listen to Mr. Anand Sharma.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA); Yes, Mr. Anand - Sharma.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as I was saying, action against one militant group does not mean action against a community. And I repeat what T have said- We as a nation as Indians and our Government and our Prime Minister have always felt pain and anquish for the Tami] people of Sri Lanka. It was for that that he risked his own life when he escaped death by a few inches after signing the agr. -ement. Let us not forget it. Tt was not for himself. Sir, but for that cause, for those values* for those principles that he took that grave risk. As a nation we must not forget that. Sir. one group which is totally alienated from all the other Tamil groups one group whose leadership does not believe in the democratic process, what is their political philosophy hastala fascist approach of liquidatihg their owe-

people fighting for the very same cause; iquidating people within their own organi-iarJon on slightest suspecion? I will have no sympathy for them. That is why, I say, et us view this, analyse this wi'h an open iiintl. For me, the TULF or the EPRLF or all other groups, those who have stood jnd struggled for the Tamil cause from laffmi and elsewhere in Sri Lanka, deserve more respect becauses they support the Agreement in spite of the fact that they were being denied the reprsentation in the Administration Councils.

So, the action against one group-—let it be made clear—should not be misinterpreted. We must not become the victms of a disinformation campaign. We must keep caur cool and try to make an effort, 'to give all possible support for the successful implementation of this Agreement which is not only unprecedented, Sir, but in future, after ten years or 15 years, when there will be complete peace prevailing in the region, posterity will remember the statesmanship of Rajiv Gandhi as the Prime Minister of India and of Mr. Jayewardene as the President of Sri Lanka.

Sir, I need not go into the details cf those friends who had said as to what we have achieved as a nation. But I feel that my nation's security interests are safeguarded, and the nation will not be threatened from its southern coast, there will not be nuclear naval bases in Trin-comalee, and we will have more strength to our voice and our demand for having the Indian Ocean declared as a zone of peace at a time when the United Nations is soon to convene a conference on this.

Sir. T disagree most vehemently with Mr. Jaswat Singh when he sa'd this Government's Sri Lankan policy is in tatters. It is not in tatters. Our line is clear, our vision is clear. We know the objective which is a national objective. And we trust make an effort to achieve that.

Before concluding. Sir T will appeal to those friends who f. re either becoming victim', of the commangn nf disinformation or knowinsrlv or unkniwinclv doine the same which these vested interest opposed to Inia's dominant regional role are doing. We must not walk into a trap. Let' there be no emotional outbursts over a campaign carried out by some western papers. A reference was made by Mr. Gopalsamy to BBC. It was ITV. I have seen that programme. I read the reports about that. Even the reports of that programme made it clear that they shot those scenes when there was no action, when there was no sign of the IPKF. So, how can our own responsible people while reading those newspaper reports or watching such programmes start believing in that and start accusing an army which has taken heavy casualties only for saving civilian lives which is doing commendable relief work today in supplying medicines and food to the people there? Let us salute that army, let us appreciate its role and let us not allow ourselves to be befooled by the campaign of others, who do not want peace in this region, who do not want success of this agreement. Thank you.

SHRl J. P. GOYAL (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, a number of points have already been dealt with by *my* friends. I want to add to them some of my points.

I think, in the world so far in no country such a situation has ever arisen that in j the name of keeping peace in another country, the army of another country has gone there but insetead of maintaining peace there, it has started fighting with those very persons for whose protection it had gone ther:. In my opinion, the Indo-Sri Lanka accord cannot be called a valid or lawful accord in the sense that the LTTE leader Prabhakaran an^ other leaders, representing the Tamilians in Sri Lanka, they were not a parry to it. It has come in the newsnaner that Mr. Prabha-karan was here in Delhi for three days in Ashoka Hotel. He was kept almost like a nrisoner was not a'lowed to go out and political leaders were also rot allowed to" meet him So, there is nothing in the Tndo-Sri T. ankan aecord to show that the leader of the LTTE was a party to the accord.

What our C!overnme"t should hive done, instep of sendne army there; on I the negotiating table all the Tamil lea-

[Shri J. P. Goyal]

ders, the Sri Lankan Government officials or their representatives and our representatives should have sat together and come to a solution rather than Mr. Jaye-wardene and Mr. Rajiv Gandhi just signing the accord and sending our army, saying we shall keep peace. What do you mean by keeping peace. You need army to keep peace, if there is any resistance. Otherwise, what for the army is needed? It seems that there was some secret agreement between the two leaders, Mr. Jayew-ardene and Mr. Gandhi that if necessary the army has got to be used against our own people, the Tamilians...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: May I just correct you? There is BO secret agreement. It is in the agreement itself. Let me read out to you the clause which says that the Sri Lankan Government will invite Indian forces when it is necessary.

SHRI I. P. GOYAL; I fully agree. I have read the agreement. That is not the point. My point is that we were sending the army for killing whom?

SHRl K. NATWAR SINGH; May I just read?

SHRI J. P. GOYAL Please hear me and then reply.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH; I want *to* correct you.

SHRI J. P. GOYAL; There must be some secret agreement. If the Sri Lankan Gvernment finds it necessary, it can call Indian army. Their army is already there that was killing our Tamilians. Why do you give them the right to call our army?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I merely want to correct your statement. It is openly mentioned in the agreement. There is no secret clause.

SHRl IP. GOYAL; Secret clause in the agreement- I am not saying clause. Whit I mean is thit there was some secret talk between the two leaders, some understanding;. There was some under-standing that by hook or crook, we are going to mppress the Tamilians.

As regards my political party, I think none of the political parties is for a separate Edam. We are [n]°t agreeing with any such demand. We do not support the demand for a separate State. We are against Khalistan. We are against ^ many things. How can such a small state like Sri Lanka be divided into two countries or three countries? We are against that; I must make it clear. But even an accused person, one who is accused of murder, has a right of hearing; he is also tried. But here, you are using the army against Tamils, na again Sinhalese, and you are not giving them the right of hearing: you are not allowing them to come to the negotiating table. In the Lok Sabha, a Member said and it has come iu 'Hindu' dated 6th, that Mr. Prabhakaran has said that let us have ceasefire for 48 hours and let us negotiate. That also you are not accepting. You say, no, surrender arms first. If the LTTE was nothing, why is there SQ much fighting? It appears that LTTE was the most powerful Tamil group and you are not negotiating with them. It means you took the responsibility of killing the Tamils there for the purpose of Mr. layewardene. There are 30, 000 men of our armed forces. There are 50 casualties a day. Official figures upto 25th October are, 788 casualties of the IPKF, and total casualties are 2266, whicl means 50 casualties a day. Who are dying? Our people are dying; ei't'her our army people o$_r$ our own Tamils ae dying there. And is said (hat spending Rs. 3 crores everyday. What for? Whit are you going to achieve? There-fore, whatever mistake has been committed by our Government, >hat can be rectified by having an immediate—unilateral if possible—ceasefire. Bring Mr. Prabha-karan and others and Sinhala Government officials also and also your officials together. Let us bvinc them all to the, negotiating table either here at Delhi or Columbo. It will give credit to our Government. Otherwise, we are in a d'fficul.. situation. I cot a letter from an Indian friend from abroad and he says that we were accusing Sinhali army that thev were killing our peonie. Now we are killins them. We have become a laughing stock in t[r]ne foreign countries. The Prime Minister yesterday in this statement said that

wherever he went, Indo-Sri Lanka agreement was appreciated. Who will say it in your face "hat it is not correct? Therefore. Please realise and appreciate the position, the difficult situation in which We find ourselves today. Whatever has been done is done. I am not abusing it or saying anything as others have said. But I would request you to t'nink over the matter, have an immediate ceasefire and •top further bloodshed. Let Mr. Prabha-Varan who has offered to negotiate come. Why should you not negotiate with him by saying that unless he surrenders arms, you will not talk? Even an accused can go upto Supreme Court and have the right of appeal. Therefore, 1 would request 'he Government *LQ* please immediately have ceasefire and then come to the negotiating table and arrive at a peaceful settlement. You withdraw your army from there gracefully. Otherwise, we are going to be in more trouble.

These are my submissions and I would again request that there should be an immediate ceasefire.

SHRl KAPIL VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): As already poinded out, the whole world has welcomed this agreement, except, of course, Pakistan. it w. s not only in the interests oi Sri. Lanka, because it seeks to ensure their national integrity, not only it is in the interest of Tamils because it seeks to give them a place of honour and self-respect and equality in Sri-Lanka, it is also in supreme interest of-India because it takes care ol our security environment. What wa^. the scenario beore the accord was signed. How many loreign forces, how many forces hostile to us were active in that area. You have seen that Israel had posted experts from MOSSAD, that notorious organisation which was responsible for kill. ng thousands of Arabs. This organisation was employed by the Sri Lankan Government to train their police and army. We know that 'he UK had sent its mercenaries. Kini Mini *or* whatever that organisation is called. China had sent its gunboats. South Africa had sent its weapons and some other military equipment. You know, Sir, everybody hag an eye on Trincomalee port which is ideally suited for a naval base and which is supposed to be one of world's best harbours. Even today, toe super-powers are interested in it Imagine, what will happen if one superpower gets hold of Trincomalee. The oner super-power also will try to come. Should we allow Sri Lanka, our neighbour, to become a cockpit ol super-power rivalries? This, of course, is not in our interest. The accord seeks to eliminate this danger. You know what is happening in the Gulf. You know what is happening in the Indian Ocean. Can we afford to open a new front in l"ne South which has been quiet all these years? We have to guard a long border in the North and West. There is tension with China, *la* the West, Pakistan has hostile intentions. In such an environment, we cannot afford to open a new front in the South. When I mention t'ms, I would lite the hon. Minister to throw light on one or two things.

1 am told that the unfriendly elements which were invited by Sri LaiiK. a are still in that area. Mr. Jjyewardene is on record "nat be invited 'hese forces. 1 am told tnai those people invited by him are still working there ana tney have not left Sn Lanka. They should leave immediately. 1 am sure Government would have ensured that they leave that place. 1 am sure the *'o°a*- - Minisier will give an assurance in this regard. We should persuade the Sri Lankaa Government iO see that they yo back trom Sn Lauka immedia ely. Then, I am told, a lot of colonisation, of Sinhalese, is going on in. and around 1 rincomalee. In fact, a ioi of i amils live in that area and it is an insurance for us. The Sinhala colonisation coupled with the presence af hostile forces will become a danger to us. 1 hope the hon. Minister will assure us that steps have been taken or are being taken to ensure that *tlViS* colonisation does not take place and, if it has already taken place, it is cleared.

Then, there is the question of the leasing of the Trincomalee area. I am told, secret negotiations were going on beiween Sri Lanka and a super power. Of course, the minister cannot 'ell us what took place between the Sri Lankan and

[Shri Kapil Verma]

other Governments in regard to this question of leasing. I suggest that we should get a guarantee from the S; i Lankan Government that in future this area will not be leased to any outside power. Perhaps, this sort of an understanding is already there.

Then there is the question of giving facilities to the Voice of America, for America t_0 broadcast from there. Sometimes they do hostile propaganda against lndia. I hope Sri Lankan Government will ensure that these facilities are no longer available to the Voice of America. They must fold up and go. We want a strong Sri Lanka, but we also want a friendly Sri Lanka and we hope that the sri Lankan Government will cooperate with us in the same manner in which we are cooperating with them. Nobody wants chaos in this backyard. We do not want power vacuum there or super power rivalries there. We do not want adventurous, mercenaries to have a happy playground in Sri Lanka,; n our backyard, because that affects us also. It is in our interest that peace and tranquility is maintained there, that there is stability in that area.

The question of IPKF has been debated a lot. I will join the whole House in paying tribute to their valour. An hon. Member mentioned about the complaint of an army officer that with li hands tied at his back he is asked to fight. That is because the instructions given to the IPKF are that they would not attack the civilians in any case and the LTTE was always having a wall of children, women, old men as a shield. So, our Jawans would not attack this wall. They were avoiding all sorts of tactics, aerial bombardment and so many things. In that process, in trying to avo' d it. there have been so many casualties among; the forces. They have dons it and we are very erateful. That way I P'aise our army. Thev have made supreme sacrifices; n carrying out our wishes and the policies of the Government.

About Ceasefire, as has already been pointed out, how can we go in for a unilateral ceasefire, not against the Government of any country but against a particular group? We cannot demoralise our army, the army which we need to fight in the north, in the west and everywhere. Army Mas certain rules. It is not a plaything. We cannot Play with it. Today if some people are saying that the IPKF be withdrawn, the question is, what will happen if they are withdrawn? Sri Lankan army carried out genocide in that area. With very great difficulty after four years they have gone to their barracks. Do we want them to come back and carry out genocide again? That will again happen if our army comes back.

Sir, I will not take much, time of the House. I will only make one or two more points. I do agree that the devolution package is the key to peace. It j_s unsatisfactory to a certain extent. Objections have been raised and even the Government of India has taken it up with the Government of Sri Lanka. I am sure those aberrations, those shortcomings, those deficiencies will be removed from that package so that in reality the aspirations of Tamil people-are met. Even moderate|Tamils have pointed out that their aspirations are not being met by those proposals. I am sure, the Government of India will see to it that tViese proposals are revised. Tamils already have achieved a lot.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Just a minute Mr. Verma.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA; What is happening today is that even Mr. layewar-dene is having $_a$ lot of difficulty in his...

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Verma, you take your seat.

SHRl KAPIL VERMA: Why should I stop? I will take only one minute more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Malaviya, if you ask him to to he will say why h«

should stop. There are Shree o: fou- more speakers.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: 1 will finish in one minute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Just a minute. Please sit down. If the House agrees, we can complete the discussion today and the Minister can reply tomorrow.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Yes, thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Yes, you please continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What about draught?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Drought situatioi will be taken up immediate]/ after the discussion.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALA VIYA. But there is a sta'ement about the prices for the rabi crops.

श्री अरविंद गणेश कुलकर्णी : मालवीय जी, रबी बाद में आयेगा, पहले ड्राउट आयेगा ।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : लेकिन स्टेटमेंट हो रही है ।

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI; Sir, what is your directive? Either after this we take up the drought situation, $_0$r, if you like it, and is the Minister is ready, we can complete the discussion on Sri Lanka today so that from to-morrow at least We will start our business.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): That is what I put before you.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat) Tommorrow is non-official day. And drought is very important. If Sri Lanka is going to be continued on (Monday, then let there be a whole-

day discussion on drought; otherwise we will not be doing justice to the drought situation.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI; *Then* you complete Sri Lanka discussion today.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Shri Kapil Verma.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): Sir, what is the decision?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA); Sri Lanka discussion will be continued

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: That means I have to come on Monday.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANMANTHAPPA): No. no, the statement will be after the Short Duration Dicussion on Sri Lanka. It is there in tht notice which has been circulated. • •

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: It is about price declaration. There will be no questions. It is a one minute statement. If the Members agree, I can make it just now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN. 'SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): No, ther$_e$ ate clarifications.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: We have to seek clarifica'ions.

SHRl YOGENDRA MAKWANA: You can ask me clarifications on drought on Monday when you discuss this. But my statement is about price declaration.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): That is much more important. It is very im-I portant.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Let there be no confusion. As per the notice, the statement will b$_e$ taken up immediately after the Short Duration Discussion is over. We are still in the midst of discussion.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Today's papers carry MGR's statement an<j the statement of the Industry Minister which have cleared all doubts. We did not have any doubts in our mind, but some Opposition friends did have some doubts and certain mis-givings. Now these have been cleared, I am very happy. There is no difference of opinion at all between M'GR and Rajiv Gandhi's Government on this issue.

I will conclude^ Sir, by saying ihat we—i. e. India—are a major power. When we say we are a major power, we have certain responsibilities also. Those responsibilities we have to carry out whch have been given to us by our geographical positon. We are a country of 80 crore people. We have certain responsibilities and we have to carry them out. We have to make certain sacrifices for that also. So the Accord that has been. signed—the world has welcomed it I am sure it will succeed and whatever deficiencies are found, I am sure the Government will Bee to it that these are removed. Thank you.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : उप सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब यह श्रीलंका एकार्ड हुआ था उस वक्त हमारी पार्टी और हमने भी इसका समर्थन किया था । लेकिन उसी वक्त मंत्री जी को याद होगा कि मैंने इस सदन में कहा था कि जब हम वहां फौज भेज रहे हैं तो यह आशंका है कि हम वहां फंस जायेंगे । यह हमने उस दिन भी कहा था और दुर्भाग्य से यही हुआ । अभी मुझे एक कहानी याद आ रही है, जो कि बहत पुरानी है । उसे आप जानते ही होंगें और बहुत लोग जानते होंगे । बहुत कड़ाके की सर्दी पड़ रही थी । गंगा के किनारे पर एक साधू खड़ा था । उस वक्त गंगा का प्योरी-फिकेशन नहीं हुआ था । उस ने देखा कि कि काला-काला कुछ चला जा रहा है । साधू ने सोचा कि यह कंबल है और वह उसको पकड़ने के लिए गंगा में कूद पड़ा बाद में पता चला कि वह तो क्रोकोडाइल था और उसने उस साधू को पकड़ लिया ऊपर से लोग हल्ला कर रहे थे कि चले आओ, चले आओ । कंबल को छोड़ दो तो बाबा जी ने कहा कि हम तो कंबल छोड़ देंगे, लेकिन यह कंबलिया भी हमको छोड़ न, तभी हम आयें । अब सवाल है कि श्रीलंका में हम चले तो गये, लेकिन वह छोडे वहां से तब तो हम लोग आयें । नहीं तो आप भी फंसे हुए हैं और हम भी फंसे हुए हैं । इसमें इंडियन आर्मी बहुत सैक्रीफाइस कर रही है, परंपरा के मुताबिक अपनी जान दे रही है । इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हैं । लेकिन अभी फिर आपसे कह देते हैं, आप तो मानेंगे नहीं । आप मानेंगे नहीं । आप पर जब-जब संकट आएगा तब कहेंगे सुपर पावर । अभी अमेरिका से लौटकर आये तो कहने लगे कि अमेरिका बड़ा दोस्त है । वह हथियार देगा और क्या-क्या देगा । सोवियत संघ से कहते हैं कि दोस्ती है । तो तीसरी सुपर पावर कौन है ? तो जब-जब आप गलती करते हैं, , फंस जाते हैं तभी आप कहने लगते हैं कि सुपर पावर है । वैसे कहते हैं कि बड़ी दोस्ती है ।

अब मैं आपसे एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं । हम लोग श्रीलंका में गए तमिल लोगों को बचाने के लिए तो जितने दिन हमारी आर्मी वहां रही उतने दिन में हमने कितने तमिलों की हत्या की है और श्रीलंका की फौज ने कितनी हत्या की थी उसी अवधि में और प्रभाकरण जो हैं उन्होंने उसी अवधि में कितने तमिलों की हत्या की थी । ये तीनों फिगर दे दीजिए तो पता चल जाएगा कि हम लोग क्या कर रह हैं । यह मैं इसलिए क ह कह रहा हूं कि आपने लोक सभा में नामंजूर कर दिया कि हम सीज फाय नहीं करेंगे ... (**समय की घन्टी**)

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी तो शुरू किया है । आपने सबको बहुत समय दिया है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हेच० अनुमनतप्पा) : यहां जितना टाइम लिखा है, उसके ऊपर यदि एनक्रोचमेंट हो तो उसको याद दिलाने के लिए घंटी है ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : यह तो ठीक है लेकिन उसमें जो लिखा हुआ है वह लिखा रहता है और होता दूसरा है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हेच० हनुमनतप्पा) : कहानी में टाइम खो जाता है ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : अब मैं शार्ट करूंगा मैं कह रहा था कि क्या भारत सरकार ने कोटा फिक्स कर लिया है कि इतने तमिल मारे जायेंगे तभी हम सीज फायर करेंगे । उसमें कितनी कमी है । कोटा कब पूरा हो जाएगा । क्यों इस हास्यास्पद स्थिति में हम लोगों को हमारे देश को विदेश मंत्रालय ले जा रहा है ? इसका भारत में भी विरोध हो रहा है यहां जितने विपक्षी बैठे हुए हैं, वह आपके दुश्मन तो नहीं हैं । हमने तो उस एकार्ड का समर्थन किया है, लेकिन अब स्थिति ऐसी हो गयी है कि उसको किया जाए । जब हम लोग कहते हैं कि युनिलेटरल सीज फायर कर लिया जाए, कहते हैं कि इससे हमारी आर्मी को, हमारे देश को नैतिक बल मिलेगा । जो लोग वहां युद्ध जारी किए हुए हैं--प्रभाकरण के आदमी, उनको कहने को कुछ नहीं रहेगा अभी हमारे गोपालसामी जी और दूसरे लोग उछल-कूद कर रहे हैं तो एक हफ्ते के बाद सब बंद हो जायेंगी । हमने तो अपनी फौज को शांति के लिए भेजा था तो मनोबल कैसे गिर जाएगा । हम तो सीज फायर कर रहे हैं, उनको युद्ध के लिए तो भेजा नहीं था । हमारी फौज ऐसी तो नहीं है कि इस बात को नहीं समझे । हमारी फौज तो शांति के लिए बराबर लड़ती रही है । इसलिए मैं फिर कहता हूं कि आप जल्दी से कोई उपाय कीजिये और वहां से अपने को निकाल लो क्योंकि आप भी साधु की तरह हैं । लड़कपन के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, इसलिए कुछ-न-कुछ हो जाता है ।

अब रह गया सवाल श्री लंका की यूनिटी और इंटिग्रिटी का । तो क्या तमिलों को मार देने से वह प्रोटेक्ट हो ज एगी । आपसे कभी भी बात नहीं करते, सुन लीजिए, मंत्री महोदय । वह आपसे इसलिए बात नहीं कर रहा है कि आपका चेहरा खूबसूरत है । इंदिरा जी ने भी बात की थी । वह इसलिए कह रहा है कि तमिलों ने हथियार लेकर उनका मुकाबला शुरू किया और उन्होंने देखा कि इस समस्या का कोई दूसरा निदान नहीं है । निदान भारत के जरिए ही किया जा सकता है । अगर सिंहलियों को यह विश्वास दिलाना था कि हम उनके देश के टुकडे नहीं करना चाहते—सायप्रेस टर्की नहीं बनाना चाहते, तो इतना खून-खराबा हो गया है । इससे बड़ी ईमानदारी किसी और की क्या हो सकती है हमने इतना खून बहाया उसकी अखंडता की रक्षा के लिए । यह किसी सभ्य आदमी के समझने के लिए काफी है । अब कोई नहीं समझता तो याद रखिये वहां भी जेड० ओ० सी० जैसी संस्था है । उन्होंने बम फेंका है । इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि आप सीज फायर करें और आप यह मत समझिये कि हमारा मतलब है कि आप अभी जाकर कर दीजिए ऐसे करेंगे तो कल जयवर्धने कहेगा "विक्ट्री श्रीलंका" । आप उनसे बात कर लीजिए उनसे कहिए कि अब वह स्टेज आ गई है जब कि उनको शांति का रास्ता अख्तियार करके समस्या का निराकरण करना चाहिए ।

जहां तक इंडियन सैक्यूरिटी का सवाल है, आप वहां गए, वहां कोई विदेशी ताकत को नहीं आने दिया । सारी बातें एचीव हो गई तो अब आप वहां क्यों हैं ? आप समस्या का निदान कीजिए, मुख्य समस्या तो हल हो गई है । इसलिए मूछ की, प्रेस्टिज की लड़ाई आप इसको बनाए हुए हैं, वे घुटने टेकेंगे तो

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

हम बात करेंगे, यह ठीक नहीं है । यह ऐथनिक प्राब्लम है और यह सारा हुआ एल० टी० टी० ई० के चलते, लेकिन आप अब इसका निदान कीजिए । मैं आपसे आग्रह करूंगा कि आप रात भर इसको सोचें क्योंकि जवाब आपने कल देना है और ज्यादा वहां पर भारतीयों का खून न बहे, न भारतीय मूल के लोगों का खून बहे, न सिंहलियों का खून बहे, आपका मेन परपज सर्व हो गया है, फारेन पावर्स को आपने वहां नहीं आने दिया, सारी बातें अब हल हो चुकी हैं ।

आखिरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि डेवलूशन आफ पावर जो हो रहा है, बडी अच्छी बातें आप करते हैं, वह जो कुछ पावर आप दे रहे हैं वे बहुत कम हैं । हम लोग चले जायेंगे तब वे मारना शुरू कर देंगे तो फिर आप फौज नहीं भेज सकेंगे । इसलिए डेवलूशन आफ पावर के ऊपर आप उनसे बातचीत कीजिए और कुछ रास्ता निकालिये जिससे उनकी रियल ऑटोनामी मिल सके । 40 साल से यह मामला चल रहा है, मैं पुरानी बातें इस समय दोहराना चाहता हूं ।

अंत में यह कहना चाहता हूं कि वहां कुछ लोग लेफ्टिस्ट माइंड के हैं, कुछ कम्यूनिस्ट हैं तो सीज फायर चाहते हैं जिनके बारे में आपको जानकारी होगी । आपने जनरल ऐमनेस्टी तो देख दी है, लेकिन कुछ लोग जो एकार्ड के पक्ष में थे, उनके लोग जेल में पड़े हुए हैं, आपको देखना चाहिए कि उनको भी जेल से रिहा किया जाए । जो लोग सिंहली और तमिल लोगों में दोस्ती चाहते हैं, जो इन दोनों को रास्ते पर लायें, उनसे एकता स्थापित कर सकते हैं, उनको रिहा करायें तो सचमुच में वहां शांति स्थापित होगी । अगर सिंहली और तमिल लोगों के बीच में दोस्ती की भावना जैनरेट करें तो वहां शांति हो सकती है ।

अभी हमारे माननीय मित्र श्री जसवंत सिंह जी ने कहा कि वहां लड़ाई में जो हमारे फौज के लोग मारे गए हैं या घायल हुए हैं, उनको पूरा कंपेंसेशन नहीं मिल सकेगा । यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई । अगर ऐसा कुछ हो तो इसका भी आप जरूर स्पष्टीकरण कर दीजिए । चाहे वह युद्ध का ऐलान करके या वैसे ही । अगर हमारे लोग मारे जा रहे हैं तो उनको वही मुआवजा मिलना चाहिए जो कि युद्ध में मिलता है । इस में आपसे अपील करना चाहता हूं ।

इतना ही कहकर मैं आपसे फिर अनुरोध करूंगा कि वहां सीज फायर यूनिलेटरली करके एक ऐसा वातावरण पैदा कीजिए जिससे वहां समस्या सुलझे । हमारी फौज हार नहीं सकती है, इंडियन फौज हार नहीं सकती है, यह हम लोग जानते हैं । लेकिन हमारे प्रयास शांति की तरफ होने चाहिए, यही मेरी आपसे प्रार्थना है ।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब किसी सरकार के पदों पर आसीन लोगों की मंशा पूरी न हो सके, किस तरह से समझौता किया जाता है, यह उनकी समझ में न आवे तो लोगों के समझाने के बाद उनको अपनी भूल को स्वीकार करना चाहिए ।

मान्यवर, श्रीलंका के बारे में शुरू से ही श्री जयवर्धने का यह कहना रहा है कि यह समस्या ऐसी है जिसको हल केवल मिलिटरी से हो सकता है । भारत में जब जनवरी 1986 में जयवर्धने आये और भारतीय पत्रकारों से उन्होंने बातचीत की तो उन्होंने कहा, मैं कोट करता हूं :

"I suggest a military solution to what I believe is a military problem."

लेकिन भारत सरकार और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का यह शुरू से ही विचार रहा है कि श्रीलंका की जो समस्या है उसका शांतिपूर्ण ढंग से समाधान होना चाहिए । और राजनीतिक समाधान होना चाहिए जिस समय यह समझौता हुआ था उस समय भी जिस दल से सम्बद्ध हूं उस दल ने और मैंने भी यह राय दी

थी कि कम से कम श्री जयवर्द्धने से समझौता करने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री को कोलम्बो में नहीं जाना चाहिए और दूसरे, देश के प्रधान मंत्री को उस समझौते में एक पक्ष नहीं होना चाहिए था, भले ही वह पंच हो सकते थे, वह आर्बिट्रेटर हो सकते हैं । लेकिन उन्होंने इस स्थिति से समझौता किया कि इससे हम शान्ति स्थापित करेंगे । लेकिन 29 जुलाई के बाद साढ़े तीन महीने हो गए आज भी हालत बदली नहीं है । जब यह समझौता हुआ उस समझौते के चौथे दिन प्रधान मंत्री मद्रास गए और वहां पर जो उन्होंने भाषण दिया उसकी 5–6 लाइन को मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूं :—

I quote from the address by the Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi at a public meeting in Madras, on 2nd August. 1987:

"I last spoke to you a little over two years ago from this some platform on the 15th Juiy, 19e5. I Had then said that there eo. t': I be only a peaceful solution to the problem in Sri Lanka. We have been sadd. n: '. ' by the many innocents who have been killed, by the b<>mh blasts, by the aerial bombing, by the artillery attacks. Lakhs have been made homeless. One and a half lakhs have come ES refugees of Tamil Nadu. Now, we have created conditions foe and end to 'he killings, for an end to the killings, for an end tc need-less stiffering, for an end to all discrimination. This is the time to stop figh ing, to stop violence and to ston the conflict.

मान्यवर, समझौते की एक धारा है 2.16 सब-क्लाज-सी

"In the event hat thn Government of Sri Lanka requests the Government of India to afford military assistance to inr-lement these proDosals. the Governrrent of India will cooperate by giving; to the Government of Sri Lanka such military assistance as and when requested. "

यह समझौते में था इसीलिए शायद हमारी मिलिटरी की सहायता ली गयी । उसका नाम रखा गया इंडियन पीस कीपिंग फोर्स यानी हम वहां पर शांति स्थापित करने जा रहे हैं । फिर इंडिया-श्रीलंका में जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ उसके बारे में सूचना एवं प्रसारण मंत्रालय ने जो पेम्फलेट प्रसारित किया उसमें से भी मैं कुछ उद्धरण पढ़ना चाहता हूं क्योंकि इसमें इसकी चर्चा की गयी है कि कैसे हम एग्रीमेंट को इम्पलीमेंट करना चाहते हैं :

"The Agreement provides that the Sri Lanka Government may call upon "he Indian Government to render military assistance, to ensure the implementation of the Agreement. As Prime Mi rioter informed the Parliament on July 31, the Sri Lanka Government made a formal reques' for such assistance jo-'n after the Agreement ne-s signed on July 29, In keeping with the commitments under the Agreement, Indian troops landed in Jaffna on July 30 for assuming peace keeping functions and for helping in the implementation of the Agreement"

मान्यवर, मेरा निवेदन यह है कि आज साढ़े तीन महीने के बाद जो हालत हो गयी है । निश्चित रूप से वहां पर लगता है शांति नहीं है । वहां पर निर्दोष लोगों की हत्या हो रही है । जिस समस्या को सुलझाने के लिए गए वह समस्या सुलझी नहीं । हम भी बल्कि वहां उलझ गए । हमारी फौज के सिपाही भी उलझ गए । यह सही है कि जो भारतीय मूल के तमिल लोग हैं उनकी हत्या हो रही है और जो शांति स्थापित करने के लिए हमारी फौज के सिपाही गये थे वे कट रहे हैं, मर रहे हैं और साथ-साथ सिंहालीज की भी हत्या हो रही है । मेरा निवेदन है कि इस सरकार को विशेष रूप से प्रधान मंत्री जी को आत्म मंथन करना चाहिए, हृदय मंथन करना चाहिए और बदली हुई समस्याओं में पुनर्विचार करना चाहिए लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जी तो बिल्कुल एक अड़ियल घोड़े का रूप अपनाये हुए हैं । वे कहते

[श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय]

हैं कि हम किसी से बात नहीं करेंगे तब तक जब तक कि वे आत्मसमर्पण नहीं करते । जिस तरह से पंजाब के आतंकवादियों के बारे में प्रधानमंत्री कहते हैं उसी तरह से उन्होंने अपना रुख बना लिया है । महोदय, 'सार्क' सम्मेलन के बाद इसी दिल्ली में संवाददाता सम्मेलन को सम्बोधित करते हुए प्रधान-मंत्री कहते हैं कि :

There is no question of a ceasefire between the Indian Peace Keeping Force and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam unless the LTTE surrenders arms and abides by ths Indo-Sri Lanka Accord. The Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi said it.

मान्यवर, मैं सदन का अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूं । लेकिन मेरा नम्र निवेदन है कि यह गौतम बुद्ध का देश है, यह राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी का देश है । हिंसा को हिंसा से खत्म नहीं किया जा सकता है, एटम बम को एटम बम से आप खत्म नहीं कर सकते । हिंसा को अहिंसा से ही खत्म कर सकते हैं । अहिंसा को चलाने वाले राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी इसी सदी में दुनिया के सबसे बड़े महापुरुष हुए । जब राष्ट्रीय आंदोलन के समय उन्हें अपनी भूल महसूस हुई तो उन्होंने अपनी उस राजनैतिक भूल को स्वीकार किया, सारे देश की जनता, देश के राजनैतिक दलों को स्वीकार कराया और उन्होंने कहा कि आन्दोलन खत्म होना चाहिए । महोदय, मैं आजादी की लड़ाई के समय चौराचौरी कांड की याद दिलाना चाहता हूं । महात्मा गांधी अहिंसा के रास्ते पर चलकर इस देश को आजाद कराना चाहते थे । लेकिन जब चौराचौरी में हिंसा हुई, वहां पर जब ब्रिटिशर्स थे, जो अंग्रेज कलक्टर था, अहिंसा का रास्ता छोड़कर भारतीयों ने उनकी हत्या कर दी तो पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के विरोध के बावजूद और अन्य नेताओं ने विरोध के बावजूद कि वह आंदोलन वापस मत लीजिए, महात्मा गांधी ने अपनी राजनैतिक भूल को स्वीकार किया और उस आन्दोलन को उन्होंने वापस लिया । इसलिए मैं भारत सरकार से नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता चाहता हूं कि... (व्यवधान)...राष्ट्र-पिता महात्मा गांधी ने अपनी भूल को स्वीकार किया था । वर्मा जी मैं इतिहास की बात कह रहा हूं... व्यवधान)...

श्री कपिल वर्मा : मैं कह रहा हूं कि कलेक्टर की हत्या नहीं हुई थी । आप रिकार्ड उठाकर देख लीजिए ।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : हत्यायें नहीं हुई तो ठीक हुआ । थानों में आग लगा दी । जब त्यायें नहीं हुई, नर संहार नहीं हुआ तो केवल थाने में आग लगाने के बाद राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी ने अपनी भूल को स्वीकार किया । मैं नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि भारत के प्रधानमंत्री को भी अपनी भूल को स्वीकार करना चाहिए, अपनी सरकार की गलतियों को स्वीकार करना चाहिए और एक तरफा युद्धविराम या सीज फायर जो भी कहें उसकी घोषणा करनी चाहिए और प्रभाकरन जो उनके नेता हैं उनको बुलाकर बातचीत करनी चाहिए । मैं यह समझता हूं कि अगर भारत सरकार इस तरह का दृष्टिकोण अपनायेगी तो इससे भारतीय मूल के जो तमिल हैं उनकी समस्याओं का समाधान होगा और इससे भारत सरकार की छवि बढ़ेगी । ऐसा कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि श्रीलंका का विरोध केवल पाकिस्तान कर रहा है या हिन्दुस्तान की विरोधी पार्टियां कर रही हैं । महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि ऐसा गैर-जिम्मेदा-राना वक्तव्य हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधानमंत्री को नहीं देना चाहिए और उन्हें अपने उन शब्दों को भी वापस लेना चाहिए । लोकतंत्र जो है उसका आधार सत्ता पक्ष और विपक्ष होता है, वह दोनों से वह चलता है । हम लोग भी देशहित की बात करते हैं । लेकिन भारत के विपक्ष की तुलना पाकिस्तान से करना मैं समझता हूं कि वह केवल वही व्यक्ति कर सकता है जिसे राजनीति के बारे में

कोई ज्ञान न हो, अबोध बालक हो और यह समझकर मैं उनको क्षमा करने के लिए तैयार हूं ।

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA (Punjab): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to mention that I maintain that conceptually, the Accord was desirable and is still desirable and necessary. The basic considerations which prompted its signing are for the good of both the countries as well as its people. But even the best of intentions, unless these are put into practice systematically^ with due consideration, can result in disaster. I cannot help feeling that once again, TVe have reached an Accord without going into sufficient details to see how the various hurdles will have to be crossed. What may go wrong? Had we taken steps in advance in case some of the un-expected things may happen to de-rail it? Had we really foiseen that we may be fighting the LTTE to disarm them? should stop. I wish to confine my talk primarily to the role of the Army in the present Sri Lanka imbroglio. Before I start the discussion, I would like to reiterate that I have the highest respect and affection for the most discplined, gallant and brave organization, the Indian Army. An organization which is (functioning wholly professionally. It is possibly the best integrated body of men which provides a steel-frame for th© integrity of the country. From its inception, the Indian Army has carried out any task allotted to it most willingly and with total commitment. Unfortunately,; t has not always "been launched into operations wifh proper, meticulous and objective planning and the correct appreciation of the task involved. The operation against China in 1962 was one example. The present involvement in Sri Lanka appears to be another. I wonder if it was realised that we may have. to use force to disarm the Tamil militants. If so, was the extent of force and effort required to do so properly appreciated? There is no doubt, again the Army was caught flat-footed to begin wifh. It, therefore, took time to gather momentum and suffered very heavy casualties. Now that ^ has taken up the unpleasant task of disciplining the people whom it had gone to help,, how long and to what extent will it be required to go on? That is a question that our Government must ask itself. Let us not forget, whatever the extent of violence and hostile activities be, our friends eventually are going to be the Tamilians in Sri Lanka. We should not cause such a divide that the very aim of the Accord is defeated. 1 mean the divide between India and the Tamilians in Sri Lanka. Nor should we subordinate its employment for a temporary political desirability. Further, can we afford *Uy* get our defence forces involved permanently or for a considerably long time in Sri Lonka? The final solution is this problem has to be political. Looking ai all these aspects, it is quite apparent that we are now on the horns of a dilem ma and the Gpvernment must accept it. It is going to be extremely difficult to extricate ourselves from the quagmire in which we have involved ourselves. If we leave the Tamilians totally disarmed, we shall be leaving them to the mercy of an unreliable, independable Sri Lanka Government and an extremely hostile civil population. One cannot help criticising the amateur fashion in which we have got involved, in this problem. Whereas I accept and approve the general concept of the Accord, we failed miserably to carry the Tamilian militants, who mattered, with us. For this we are paying and will 'nave to pay dearly. What is a great pity is that webave put ourselves in an impossible position. On top of that, we have again involved the defence services, generally and the Army particularly in a no-win situation thoughtlessly. I realise and respect the emotional anguish of the Tamilians of lndia. I, however, appeal to them not to blame and demigrate the Army for the blunders of the Government. To kill civilians is most unpleasant for the Army.

Violence brutalises people. In this type of opaeration civilians do get in the way and get killed. It would be wrong to consider that our army is wilfully trying to kill civilians, and this aspect we must

[Sardar Jagjit Singh Aurora]

bear in mind, and please bear in mind that the army belongs to you and ir. the army you have near and dear one'., therefore, if you want to blame anybody, blame the Government's Bumbling policy and not the armed forces.

I consider militarily it would be wrong to carry out a stop-and-go type of operation. Rather than calling for a ceasefire, you consider the future course of action. Friends of the LTTE should undertake covert diplomacy to resolve the basis on which a fresh modus operandi can be agreed for disarming the LTTE. While the operations are in progre s, there is no bar to negotiations and 1 hope that the Indian Army....

SHRI K_v NATWAR SINGH: Would the General repeat the last two sentences?

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Militarily it would be wrong to carry out a stop-and-go type of operation. In other words, have cease-fire and start operations again. Therefore, I suggest rather than calling for a ceasefire, you consider a future course of action. Friends of the LTTE should undertake covert diplomacy to resolve the basis on which a Hesh modus operandi can be worked out for disarmament. While the operations are in progress there should be no bar to negotiations in this type of operations. And 1 appeal tothe Government that they must encourage this and must carry them out. A demand for complete and unconditional surrender is wrong and can only lead to greater bitterness and more bloodshed. And last of all, I join Major Jaswant Singh and Mishraji that the army which is involved in this operation must get recognition an. J it should get the benefit as if they had been involved in any other operation fighting an enemy.

SHRl CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, although the Government has taken a firm position regarding the proposal of ceasefire, I would once again reque t the honourable Minister whether he considers it desirable to reconsider the decision already taken by the Government as announced in the other House of Parliament. Now, 1 read in a Calcutta newspaper yesterday that Mathia and some others have written to our Prime Minister suggesting that if a team of reprpesentatives representing all the political parties in Tamil Nadu and of Parliament is sent there, they are prepapred. to talk and even initiate further discussions. I do not know the veracity of that newspaper report. The report was a report from Colombo pub-

ed in some Calcutta newspaper of yesterday. 1 am mentioning about it only becau e of the fact that it is desirable on the part of the Government to initiate fresh poliieal initiative to attain the poli-tical aim. As has been incorporated in the agreement, as has already been accepted by many of us in this House, the main objectives of the agreement are; firstly cessation of hostilities and return of peace and normalcy; secondly, political settlement of the ethnic conflict in Sri Lonka; and, ihirdly, protecting the Sri Lankan poiity from foreign interference. These are the major objectives of the agreement for which even with some reservation we have given our support. I think that now the situation demands a fresh initiative—I further qualify it—a political initiative lo see that the objective of the

ement is fulfilled and, for that, the first political initiative is to have a unilateral cease-fire Either you yourself order a cea e-fire or you find out some ' mechanism by which a fresh political initiative can be taken.

Now. Sir, so far as the objectives of the agreement are concerned, I am sor. -strained to say thai none of the objective has so far been revised. So far as the fust objective is concerned, I do not like to dilate upon that. I only want to mention two things about it. One is that peace has not returned *to* Sri Lanka. From our side, the Indian army has willy-nilij been involved in a conflict for a cause which is not well defined. As a matter of fact, if you allow me to say-precisely, I will say that our army is engaged in a conflict on a foreign soil for somebody else's interet. So far as the second aspect or objective of the agreement is concerned, that is, political settle-men of the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka

that political settlement has been visualised by the Government as well as by many of u. s when we; ay that there should be greater autonomy for the constituent units within a united Sri Lanka, that is, devolution of more powers. It is known that there has not been any agreement on that issue also. As I understand, the two Bills introduced in the Sri Lankan Parliament do not include all the proposals initiated up to December 19 last and even the TULF, in a public statement, made it clear—1 would just read out only a single sentence by saying this:

> "The two Bills, the 13th amendment to the Constitution and the Provincial Councils Bill presented to the Sri Lankan Parliament do not meet the aspirations of the Tamils nor are they commensurate with the loss of life and sufferings and privation suffered by the Tamils. "

The Prime Minister has said in his yesterday's statement that although the hopes and aspirations of the Tamil people b not been fulfilled by the two Bills imro duced in the Sri Lankan Parliament, he hope that at a certain given point of time there might be some changes also. In this respect, I would only like to draw the attention of the House to the ruling or decision given by the Speaker of the Sri! Lankan Parliament only yesterday or the day before yesterday. Now, Sir, this decision of the Speaker came following the speech of Mr. Lalit Athulathmulali. And his contention was that there have been a number of in tances where the Government of the day had decided to accept the determination of the Supreme Court. The decision of the Speaker of Sri Lanka makes it clear that the Supreme Court is the final determining authority in the matter of accepting any amendment regarding devolution. Naturally it is for the Minister, to explain how you and the Prime Minister visualized a situation when suitable changes can be brought about even after the passage of rhe two Bills in the Sri Lankan Parliament. That has been altogether negated. Yet the Supreme Court is the final authority and the Internal Security Minister says that it has always been the practice in Sri Lanka to pi what, it is determined by the Parliament. We have got nothing to say. Therefore, the devolution question is very important, and 1 think that is a very important part of fu. 'filling the political aspirations of the Tamil people in Sri Lanka.

Now, I conclude. 1 again urge a fresh poiitical move. This task cannot be fulfil Ld merely by the military course. Military course cannot solve this prob-blem.

Lastly, 1 do not know whether the Government is aware of the fact that the US attitude towards the Sri Lankan question has changed. I do not know why? I frankly admit it. I understand that Washing!on-based Heritage Foundation presented a special paper on the Sri Lankan problem to the US S. State Department. i his was presented two months before the agreement was signed. If they know about it, 1 think the Government should: hare this information with the House, because that is a special paper prepared for advising i ha President of the United States in determining its policy towards Sri Lanka-visa-vis India.

Lastly, I have also found that Mr. Jayewardene has shifted his ground in respect of his commitment in respect of Batticaloa and Trincamalee. I have got certain cuttings with me, but I shall not quote from them in deference to your wish and I shall conclude. The' Government should exercise more altertness and at th$_e$ same time again I repeat, proper, fresh initiative in the matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Discussion concluded. The Minister will reply tomorrow. Now. Statement by Minister.

STATEMENT BV MINISTER RE PROCUREMENTMIENIMUM SUPPORT PRICE FOR RABI CROPS OF 1987-88.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION IN THE MINISTRY OP AGRICULTURE (SHRl YO-GENDRA MAKWANA): Sir, the Government have fixed the procurement/.